

No Peace
with Rome

JOSEPH HALL, D.D.

sometime Dean of Worcester,

Bishop of Exeter, and

Bishop of Norwich

T H E H A R R I S O N T R U S T

1998



The true Picture of the Right Reuerend father in God
IOSEPH HALL Bishop of NORWICH. Samuell. Waker. 1636

FOREWORD

Joseph Hall (1574 – 1656) was Bishop of Norwich from 1641 to 1647. He represented the Church of England at the Synod of Dort in 1618. His book *No Peace with Rome* is a small work but a very powerful one. It was reprinted in 1844 by the Religious Tract Society, with a foreword by the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, who described the title as ‘a watchword and a volume’.

Hall’s style is lucid, elegant, and epigrammatic, which assists him in making, in small compass, this masterly survey of the controversy with Rome. The conclusion to which he comes – that there can be no peace with Rome – is one that is of the greatest significance for today, and deserves the most careful scrutiny by all who call themselves Protestants. The ecumenical movement proceeds on the assumption that eventually some rapprochement can be arrived at with Rome. That is its very *raison d’être*. But Hall shows conclusively that such thinking is fundamentally wrong and misguided. The terms of the controversy make such an outcome impossible from the start.

Romanism and Reformed Christianity are mutually exclusive systems, and like oil and water they can never mix. It is essential that Protestants should come to recognise this as axiomatic, otherwise they will be drawn into the ecumenical movement and waste their time and energies which could be devoted to better purposes. They will be deluded into thinking that some way can be found through the impasse; they will be told that though obstacles may arise they are only temporary setbacks, and if they persevere they will get there in the end. But Hall’s message is, You will never get there. It is an impossible task; you cannot square the circle, and you will never reconcile Reformed Christianity to Romanism without corrupting the doctrines of grace and making shipwreck of the faith.

It might be as well to deal briefly here with two objections which might be raised by some. The first is, that much has happened since Hall wrote and that the Church of Rome has surely changed in its attitude towards Protestants. Today, it calls them ‘separated brethren’, not heretics. But Rome has not changed; it is Protestantism which has changed, and it is this change amongst Protestants which enables Rome to regard them in a different light. Most Protestants today are ignorant of the teachings of the Church of Rome and do not knowingly reject them as the Reformers and their fathers did. Therefore they may be regarded as ‘separated brethren’ who may one day be brought to accept Rome’s teaching and authority. But those who knowingly reject the doctrines of Rome and regard them as erroneous are heretics still.

Secondly, there are those who say that we already share a measure of common faith with Rome in that we hold to the same Catholic creeds (the Apostles’ Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed). But Rome has added many things to these creeds, and the new dogmas she has introduced destroy the foundation that is laid in the creeds. For example, the

dogma of transubstantiation or the multi-presence of Christ's physical body in the mass, overthrows the incarnational teaching of Scripture and the creeds, which affirm that Our Lord assumed a real human body which could not be present in more than one place at any one time. The argument therefore that we share a common credal faith with Roman Catholics is shown to be a figment.

It is vitally important that we all understand these things, stop playing ecumenical games with Rome, and as Protestants get back to our roots, and engage once more in our proper calling, which is to publish the Gospel of God's free grace in Jesus Christ.

Devizes

October 9th., 1998

David Samuel

TO THE
TRUE SOUND AND HOLY CHURCH OF GOD,
WHERESOEVER WARFARING UPON EARTH.

I present unto thee, dear and holy mother, this poor unworthy token of my love and loyalty; the not so pleasing as true report of thy future broils. How much gladder should I have been, if thy Spouse has so thought good, to have been the messenger of thy peace and security! But since the great and wise Moderator of all things hath thought a palm fitter for thee than an olive, it is for thee to think of victory, not of rest. Thou shalt once triumph in heaven, and rest for all; but in the meantime, here is nothing to be looked for but ambushes, skirmishes, tumults. And how cheerfully must thou needs both bear and overcome all oppositions, that art not more sure of the necessity of thy warfare, than of the happiness of thy success; whilst thou seest thy glorious Husband not only the leader of this field, but a most just and merciful crowner of thy conquest! Certainly, it is as impossible for thee to miscarry, as to sit still and not fight. Behold, all the forces of heaven and earth conspire, and rejoice to come voluntaries unto this holy war of thine, and promise thee a most happy issue. Address thyself, therefore, as thou art wont, courageously to this work of God: but remember first to inquire, as thou dost, at Abel. Spare no tears to thy desperate sister, now thine enemy; and calling heaven and earth to witness, upon thy knees beseech and entreat her, by her own soul, and by the dear bowels of Christ, by those precious drops of his bloody sweat, by that common price of our eternal redemption, that she would at the last return to herself, and that good disposition which she hath now too long abandoned; that she would forbear any more, as I fear she hath hitherto wilfully done, to fight against God. But if she shall still persist to stop her ears against thee, and to harden herself in rebellion against her God; forget, if thou canst, who she once was; and fly mercilessly upon this daughter of Belial, that vaunts herself proudly in the glory of her munition. Go, smite, destroy, conquer, and reign, as the worthy partner of thine Husband's throne. For me, I shall in the meantime be as one of thy rude trumpets, whose noise shall both awaken thy courage unto this spiritual battle, and whose joyful congratulations shall, after thy rich spoils, applaud thy happy return in the day of thy victory.

J.H.

CONTENTS

page

S. I	The state of the now Roman Church	8
S. II	The commodities and conditions of peace	11
	1. THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF RECONCILIATION	
S. III	The obstinate and averse disposition of the Romanists	13
	2. THE CONFESSION OF THE SAME CREED IS NOT SUFFICIENT	
S. IV	That the confession of the same creed is not with them sufficient for peace	15
	3. THE NATURE OF THE THINGS CONTROVERTED	
S. V	The impuration or corruption of the Roman Church and their impossibility of reconciliations, arising from that wilful fable of the Pope's infallibility	18
S. VI	That the other opinions of the Romish Church will not admit reconciliation	23
	<i>A. Those which chiefly respect man</i>	
S. VII	The Romish heresy concerning justification	25
S. VIII	Concerning freewill	28
S. IX	Concerning merits	31
S. X	Concerning satisfaction	33
S. XI	Concerning purgatory	36
S. XII	Concerning pardons	37
S. XIII	Concerning the distinction of mortal and venial sin	39
	<i>B. Those which principally respect God</i>	
	Concerning Scripture	
S. XIV	The canon of Scripture	41
S. XV	The insufficiency of Scripture	43
S. XVI	The authority of Scripture	44
	Concerning Christ's person and offices	
S. XVII	Transubstantiation	45
S. XVIII	The multipresence of Christ's body	47
S. XIX	The sacrifice of the mass	49
S. XX	The number of mediators and the invocation of saints	51
	Concerning Worship	
S. XXI	The superstitious, heathenish, and ridiculous worship of the papists	53
	4. THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF THE MEANS OF RECONCILIATION	
S. XXII	The impossibility of the means of reconciliation	56

NO PEACE WITH ROME:

WHEREIN IS PROVED, THAT,
AS TERMS NOW STAND, THERE CAN BE NO RECONCILIATION,
OF THE REFORMED RELIGION WITH THE ROMISH:
AND THAT THE ROMANISTS ARE IN ALL THE FAULT.

WRITTEN FIRST IN LATIN BY

J. H.,

AND NOW ENGLISHED.

*What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and
her witchcrafts are so many?—2 Kings ix. 22.*

SECT. I.—*The State of the now Roman Church.*

THERE is no one question doth so rack the minds of men at this day, as this of the Church.

The infancy of the Church was sore and long vexed with heresies of an higher nature, concerning God, concerning Christ, which still struck at the head: but her vigorous and hoary age is exercised with a slighter quarrel concerning ourselves, which yet raiseth up the greater broils everywhere, by how much every man naturally loves himself more than God.

Not to meddle with any foreign questions of this nature, too many seem unto me to misconceive the state of our Church, and the Romish, as if they had been always two: as if, from their first foundations, they had been sensibly severed in time and place, like to Babylon and Jerusalem, or those two famous cities opposed in St. Austin's learned discourse.

Hence are those idle demands of some smattering questionists: Where our Church hath thus long hid itself? What year and day it came to light? In what age that other Church lost itself? Why

we have withdrawn ourselves no further from them? What is become of our forefathers? Which was the religion of the former world?

From hence have those sharp and rigorous censures passed on both sides; whether of novelty, or of the desperate condition of those souls which have departed out of their own way.

Alas! what monsters both of opinions and questions have risen hence, and have vexed, not their own authors only, (for the Delphic Oracle said well, "It is fit a man should have as he doth,") but, together with them, the whole Church of God! How many silly souls have splitted upon this rock, which had never needed any votive monument of their wreck, if they had but learned to hold no other difference betwixt us and Rome than must needs be granted betwixt a church miserably corrupted and happily purged; betwixt a sickly, languished, and dying Church, and one that is healthful, strong, and flourishing!

Neither therefore did that Valduſus of France^a, nor Wickliffe of England, nor Jerome of Prague, nor Luther of Germany, ever go about to frame a new church to themselves, which was not; but only endeavoured, not without happy success, to cleanse, scour, restore, reform that church which was, from that filthy soil both of disorder and errors wherewith it was shamefully blemished. All these rather desired to be accounted physicians to heal, than parents to beget a church.

And the same have we carefully done ever since, and do seriously and ingenuously profess of ourselves at this day.

Rome is alike to us as it was of old to Jerome, with Eugubium, Rhegium, Alexandria; save that this city is both more famous and more near us. Places do not vary either faith or title. What church soever God shall call daughter, we will call sister: and so we safely may.

How many honest and chaste matrons have we known, that have been ashamed of a lewd sister, and have abhorred filthiness in one of their own blood! So it fareth now with us. Rome is overgone with heresy, with idolatry. Let her practise her whoredom at home by herself: it was not for us, with the safeguard of our honesty, to dwell with such a partner.

Not only her wickedness hath thrust us out; but her violence. We yield, therefore, and sorrowfully complain with the prophet,

^a [Peter Wald, a merchant of Lyons, the sect of Waldenses—but this is stated by Mosheim to be the founder of doubtful.]

How is the faithful city become an harlot ! It was full of judgment, and justice lodged therein ; but now it is full of murderers. Thy silver is become dross, and thy wine is brewed with water, Isaiah i. 21, 22.

Away with the imperious name of a mother ! We are all the same Church, by the virtue of our outward vocation, whosoever, all the world over, worship Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, and Saviour of the world, and profess the same common creed. Some of us do this more purely, others more corruptly ; in the mean time we are all Christians, but sound Christians we are not.

But how harshly doth this sound to a weak reader, and more than seems to need reconciliation with itself, that the Church should be one, and yet cannot be reconciled ! Certainly, yet so it is. The dignity of the outward form, which comprehends this unity in itself, avails nothing to grace, nothing to salvation, nothing to the soundness of doctrine. The net doth not strait make all to be fish that it hath dragged together ; ye shall find in it vile weeds, and whatsoever else that devouring element hath disgorged.

The Church is, at once, one in respect of the common principles of faith ; and yet, in respect of consequences, and that rabble of opinions which they have raked together, so opposed, that it cannot, by any glue of concord, as Cyprian speaketh, nor bond of unity, be conjoined. That which Rome holds with us makes it a church ; that which it obtrudes upon us makes it heretical. The truth of principles makes it one ; the error and impiety of additions makes it irreconcilable.

Neither doth this late and spurious brood of traditions more oppose us than it doth those very principles of religion which the authors themselves desire to establish.

Look on the face therefore of the Roman church, she is ours and God's ; look on her back, she is quite contrary, anti-christian.

More plainly, (for it is no disputing in metaphors, as Clemens said well,) Rome doth both hold the foundation and destroy it. She holds it directly, destroys it by consequent. In that she holds it, she is a true church, howsoever impured : in that she destroys it, whatever semblance she makes of piety and holiness, she is a *church of malignants*, Ps. xxvi. 5. If she did altogether hold it, she should be sound and orthodox ; if altogether she destroyed it, she should be either no church or devilish :

but now that she professes to hold those things directly, which by inference of her consequences she closely overthrows, she is a truly visible church, but an unsound. In what she holds the principles, we embrace her; in what she destroys them, we pity her error, and hate her obstinacy.

The common bond of Christianity never ties us to favour gross errors so much as with silence. There is no such slavery in the dear name of a sister, that it should bind us to give either aid or countenance to lewdness: *Have no such fellowship*, saith St. Paul, *but rather reprove*, Eph. v. 11. So we have done, both modestly and earnestly. The same is befallen us which befell the blessed apostle; we are become their enemies for telling the truth, Gal. iv. 16.

Behold, now we are thrust out of door, spat upon, railed at, and, when opportunity serves, persecuted with most curious torments. And, lest any mischief should be wanting, obstinacy is now at last added unto error, and a cruel rage, arising from impatience: and now their wickedness began to please them more, because it displeasèd us.

And what should we now do in such a case; we, the despised and rejected patrons of this spiritual chastity? To let fall so just a cause, we might not, unless we would cast off that God who challenges this plea for only his. To yield and give in, were no other than to betray the truth of God, and damn our own souls. No course remains but this one; (and here is our only safety;) with all our courage and skill to oppose the wicked paradoxes and idolatrous practices of the Romish church, till either she be ashamed of herself, or repent that ever she was.

SECT. II.—*The Commodities and Conditions of Peace.*

Beautiful is the name of Peace, as Hilary speaketh, and truly sacred, and such as scarce savoureth of the earth. Neither did the Hebrews by any other term choose rather to express all happiness and perfection of living. Neither is there any thing which the angels did more gladly congratulate unto men, or which Christ did more carefully bequeath, or the apostles more earnestly enjoin. How oft, and how vehemently, doth the Spirit entreat and command us to have peace!

“But this,” thou sayest, “is every man’s wish, to have peace: but what if peace will not be had?” Lo, then, St. James charges

us to *make peace*, James iii. 18, by our endeavours, by our patience. Once made, and had; what if it will not stay with us? Then St. Paul bids to *follow those things which concern peace*, Rom. xiv. 19. What if it will needs away and hide itself? Yet then St. Peter commands to *follow*, and *inquire after it*, 1 Pet. iii. 11. What if, once found, it refuse to come, as Abraham's servant presupposed of Rebekah? Even then *study to be quiet*, saith St. Paul; or, as the word implies, *be ambitious of peace*, 1 Thess. iv. 11.

So let the Author of peace love us as we love peace! Who is there that would not rather wish, with Constantine, quiet days, and nights free from care and vexation? It was a speech worthy of an emperor and a Christian that fell from Jovianus about that querulous libel of the Macedonians: "I hate contention; and those that are inclined to concord, I love and reverence."

Our adversaries would make us believe they profess and desire no less with an equal zeal of charity and agreement. God be judge betwixt us both; and whethersoever persists to hate peace, let him perish from the face of God and his holy angels! Yea, that this imprecation may be needless, he is already perished: for, as Cyprian, according to his wont, gravely, "They cannot come to the reward of peace, which have broken the peace of God with the fury of discord."

And surely, what but the flames of hell can determine the ambition of these fiery and boiling spirits? Basil observes well, that God's fire gave light, and burned not: contrarily, the fire of hell burneth without light; and therefore is well worthy of those who, despising the light of truth, delight themselves in the flames of contentions.

Those are the true haters of peace which do wilfully patronise errors contrary to the Christian faith. So long as we must dwell by these tents of Kedar, we shall too justly complain, with the Psalmist, *I love peace; but, in the mean while, they are bent to war*, Ps. cxx. 7.

And as for us, which profess ourselves the ingenuous clients of peace, since we must needs fight, it is not for us to do nothing. For that blessed choir of angels, before their *Peace upon earth*, well sung, *Glory to God in the highest heavens*, Luke ii. 14: and St. James describes the wisdom of God to be *first pure, then peaceable*, James iii. 17: and that Chosen Vessel implies no

less, when, to his charge of peace, he adds, *if it be possible*, Rom. xii. 18.

That is as impossible to every good man which ought not to be done, as that which cannot be done. Neither, indeed, as the rule of lawyers runs, can we be said to be able to do that which we cannot honestly do. *God*, saith St. Paul, *is not the author of confusion, but of peace*. It is a wicked peace, it is no peace, that necessarily breeds confusion. That peace is worthy of a defiance which proclaims war with God. And I would to God that peace, which Rome either can perform or dare promise, were of any better, of any other nature.

Well, then, let it be our present task carefully to discuss St. Paul's condition of possibility; and teach how vain it is to hope that a true, holy, and safe peace can be either had or maintained with our present Romanists: whether we regard the averse and stubborn disposition of the one side, or the nature of the matters controverted, or, lastly, the impossibility of those means whereby any reconciliation may be wrought.

These three shall be the limits, wherein this our not unprofitable nor yet unseasonable work shall suffer itself to be bounded.

SECT. III.—*The obstinate and averse disposition of the Romanists.*

And as for the first, I suppose we need not labour much. Indeed, God can easily make the wolf to dwell with the lamb, and the leopard to lodge with the kid, Is. xi. 6. How easy is it for him, so to soften the adamantine hearts of men, by bathing them in the blood of that Immaculate Lamb, that they should melt into pure love! But, as the times now are, it would be no less miraculous to find a popish heart truly charitable to us, than to see the lions fawning upon Daniel.

Even where there is strife about indifferent things, there is necessarily required a conspiring of the minds of them which would be reconciled; neither is it enough, that one side is content, together with arms, to lay down hatred. And how will our Romanists endure this? Surely, that hatred of Eteocles to his brother, or that of Vatinius*, is but mere love to this of papists.

Alas! when and where are we not spat upon as the most

* [The proverbial hatred between Vatinius and Cicero. See Orat. in Vatin. Cic. Opp. Oxon. 1783. t. vi. p. 61.]

desperately heretical enemies of the Church? Rome admits Jews into her bosom, from whose hands their pope's holiness disdains not to receive the book of the Law of God; but protestants she may not endure. That which Socrates complains, as injuriously done by Theodosius, a Grecian bishop, against the very Macedonian heretics, is daily done by them against us. No Arians, no Circumcellion heretics, were ever more cruel: and these idle fablers, in the mean time, slander us to the world, as guilty of the same outrageous proceedings against them.

What heresy is there in all times which that Romulean wolf and her bawling clients are not wont to cast upon us? One while, we are the scholars of Simon Magus, because we do but once mention grace and salvation; for what have we else to do with that wicked sorcerer? Another while, we are fetched from the cursed school of Eunomius, for that we attribute too much to faith; and yet no more than that holy heretic St. Paul. One while, we are Pepuzians, that ascribe too much to women. Then we are Origenists, for holding the image of God to be defaced in man; then contrarily, Proclians, for holding the sin of concupiscence not enough defaced. One while, we are the followers of Sabellius, because, I think, we lived in the same age with Servetus; another while, of Eutyches, because we lived in the time of Swinckfeldius; for what business have we ever had else with those branded heretics? We are Pelagians, one while, for holding the wages of sin to be death; then we are Donatists, for admitting none but the just into the church of the elect. Sometimes we are Manichees, for denying freewill; straight we are Arians, for refusing traditions; then Novatians, for taking away penance. Another while we are Aërians, for rejecting oblations for the dead and fastings; then Jovinianists, for not allowing a slippery and varnishing faith; the followers of Vigilantius, for disclaiming the adoration of relics; of Nestorius, for disliking the asservation of the sacramental bread. Now we are Xenaites, for demolishing of images; then we are Lampetians, for disallowing the servitude of idle vows.

It matters not, whether the foul mouth of that hired strumpet accuse Timotheus the Presbyter, or Athanasius the Bishop, so that somebody be smitten. It matters not what be spoken, so it be malicious. That is fully resolved of, which Nazianzen hath: "No man shall hold in the reins of a riotous and lawless tongue." For, as Jerome saith well, "It is the pastime of the wicked, to

slander the good." That therefore which was the solemn fashion of the Lindians, never to do service to their Hercules without railing, the same is too ordinary with these public heralds of our patience: "Our daily furnace," as Austin speaks wittily, "is our adversaries' tongue."

How easily might I here unload whole carts of reproaches that have been heaped together by the scurrilous parasites of Rome! What rivers of blood, what bonfires of worthy saints, might I here show my reader! All these the world knows and feels too much.

And as for those honest and goodnatured men which would needs undertake to be sticklers of these strifes, as Cassander, Fricius, the Interimists, and that nameless apologist of the French, how ill have they sped on both parts! with whom it hath no otherwise fared, methinks, than with some fond shepherd that thrusts himself betwixt two furious rams running together in their full strength, and abides the shock of both. Neither may it ever succeed better to those kind Philistines which will be bringing this ark of God into the house of Dagon.

And for us, since we must needs be put to it, we shall not here, as it often falls out in other quarrels, strive to our loss. Abraham fared well by the dissensions of Lot; all the milk and honey of whole Palestine hereupon befell to him; whereof he should else have shared but the half. Doubtless these contentions, through the goodness of God, shall enrich us with a great increase both of truth and glory.

SECT. IV.—*That the Confession of the same Creed is not with them sufficient for Peace.*

It is not Cassander's speech only, but every wise and honest man's, that the Creed is the common cognizance of our faith; and we all do with one voice willingly profess it.

Surely Theodoret, when he would by a favourable report allay the bitter contentions of those ancient Christians of Antioch, writes thus: "Both parts," saith he, "made one and the same confession of their faith; for both maintained the Creed of the Nicene Council." And yet this position is spitefully handled by cardinal Bellarmine, and can scarce draw breath since his last stripes: "What care we," saith he, "for the same Creed? Faith is not in words, but in the sense."

And indeed, I remember what Ruffinus reports done by Arius.

That worthy Constantine had charged him to write what faith he held: he delivered him a Creed, in words, ours, in sense, his own. And how right his wicked brood took after their father in the ensuing times of the Church let histories witness. Sure I am, whosoever shall read the Creeds of their several sects shall hardly fetch out any thing which an orthodox censurer would think worthy of reproof. How oft do they yield Christ to be God, yea, God of God, and yet perfidiously reserve to themselves in the mean time that absurd conceit, that he was created *ex non entibus!*

As therefore Severianus the Syrian, in Theodoret, spake Greek as a Grecian, but pronounced it like a Syrian; so there may be many which may speak truths, but pronounce them heretically. "For all heresies," saith Irenæus, "talk of one God, but mar him with their misconceits." "Yea, for the most part, all heresies," saith Chrysologus, "set a face of the Trinity." To little purpose. It was not ill said of Gratian, "That no man is to care for words, since that not the meaning should serve the words, but the words rather the meaning."

Let us grant all this, and more. Let it be said of the Creed, as Jerome said of the book of Job, that every word abounds with senses. "There is no divine word," as Tertullian speaketh wisely, "so dissolute and diffused, that only the words may be defended, and not the true meaning of the words set down." To put the cardinal out of this needless fear, the proper and native sense of the Creed may be fetched out: and I add yet more (except but that one article of Christ's descension into hell, which Ruffinus confesses he could not find either in the Roman or eastern Creeds) is openly confessed on both parts.

And yet for all this we are never the nearer to peace; for from these common principles of faith the subtle device of heretical pravity hath fetched strange and erroneous consequences, which, by their sophistical and obstinate handling, are now improved into heresies; and dare now threaten, not only opposition, but death unto those very principles from which they are raised.

Of this kind are the most of those Romish opinions which we undertake to censure in this discourse.

But if, by the universal consent of all, it should appear that both word and sense are entire, that both the principles and necessary conclusions thence deduced are undeniably sound, "yet," saith Bellarmine, "there can be no peace with Lutherans." Let all the world know this and wonder.

Our king, (be it spoken to the envy of those which cannot emulate him, an incomparable divine for a prince, yea, a prince of divines, a king of men, and a wonder of kings, mighty both with his sceptre and his pen,) going about in that learned and ponderous discourse to clear himself from the aspersion of heresy, which that foul hand had unworthily cast upon him, professes solemnly and holily, that whatsoever is contained either in the sacred Scriptures, or the three famous Creeds, or the four first General Councils, that he embraces with both arms; that, he proclaims for his faith; that, he will defend with his tongue, with his pen, with his sword; in that, he will both live and die.

Yea, but this is not enough, saith that great antagonist of princes; for there are other points of faith wherewith religion is now of late times enlarged; as transubstantiation, purgatory, the pope's primacy; a whole dozen of these goodly articles hath the Tridentine council created in this decayed age of the world, lest the fathers of Italy should seem to come short of the apostles, and the Pope of Christ; any parcel whereof whosoever shall presume to call in question is an heretic presently, and smells of the fagot.

And how ordinarily is that laid in every dish, "That he cannot be a member of the Church which withdraws his obedience from their pope the head of the Church."

Neither is that any whit milder which Gratian cites from pope Nicholas the Second: "Whosoever goes about to infringe the privilege of the Roman church, or derogates from her authority, is an heretic."

But that is yet well worse which the allowed table of the decree hath peremptorily broached: "Whosoever obeys not the pope's commandment incurs the sin of idolatry," or (as Gregory the Seventh, from whom Gratian would seem to borrow this, which yet is not to be found in his epistles,) "of paganism."

Whatsoever therefore Christ Jesus, whatsoever the apostles, whatsoever the councils and fathers of the primitive church have commended to us to be believed, shall avail us little, neither can ever make us friends, unless we will be content to beslave our faith unto their popeling.

And can they think we will look at peace upon such a condition? That hope were bold and foolish that could expect this. Neither do they more scornfully cast us out of the bosom of their church for spitting at these articles of straw, which their vanity

hath devised, than we can confidently condemn and execrate their presumption which have so imperiously obtruded such trash as this upon the Church of God.

SECT. V.—*The impuration or corruption of the Roman church, and their impossibility of reconciliation, arising from that wilful fable of the Pope's infallibility.*

But to leave this first head of our adversaries' indisposition to peace; say that the papists could be content to hearken to an agreement (which I can never hope to see while Rome is itself); say they should seek it; yet, as things now stand, while they will not, and we may not, stir one inch from our station of judgment, God forbids, the truth debars our reconciliation. We dare not, whatsoever some kind-hearted mediators may persuade us, either divide Christ or betray him with a kiss. The truth is on high: "They may well ascend to us," as Leo said of old; "but for us to descend to them is neither safe nor honest."

First of all, how too plain is it that the Roman church is palpably declined from that ancient purity of religion which she once professed! It is not more certain and sensible that the city of Rome is descended from her seven hills to the Martian plains that lie below them, or that the spiteful heathens of old, as Eusebius reports, turned the sacred monument of the tomb of Christ into the temple of their Venus.

What a cloud of witnesses have we of this noted decay of that church! yea, witnesses of their own!

To begin with the other sex. Hildegardis, a nun, and a famous prophetess of her time, accuses the apostolical order of the utter extinguishing of religion amongst them: Matilda, or Maud, who lived in the same age, censures them with common apostasy from the Christian faith: and both of them, by some extraordinary revelation, clearly and directly prophesied of this religious and holy restoration of the Church which our days see accomplished. St. Bridget, the foundress of the order of St. Saviour, which was canonized by pope Urban, sticks not to teach openly in her writings that the pope doth "torment, yea, crucify the souls of the elect;" and boldly foretells that all his followers and abettors and whole clergy shall be cut off, and that his see shall sink down into the bottom of hell; and this she doth so tartly and vehemently, that the Romanists of those times threatened and endeavoured to burn her alive. Robert, our bishop of

Lincoln, to whom the greatness of his head gave a homely but famous name, whom Illyricus misnamed Rupertus, a worthy and peerless man in his age, durst before the pope's own face openly accuse the pastors of his time to be the spoilers of the earth, the dispersers and devourers of God's flock, the utter wasters of the holy vineyard of God. That Carthusian of Cologne, which is said to have gathered that book of the Bundle of Times, complains that truth was then perished from the sons of men. Petrus de Aliaco, a cardinal, confesses that the ancient divines built up the Church, but the then present seducers destroyed it. And unto these agree John de Rupescissa, a monk; Picus, earl of Mirandula; Trithemius, the abbot; Laurence Valla; and those worthy lights of the Council of Basil, the cardinal of Arles and Thomas de Corsellis. But Nicholas Clemangis, the archdeacon of Bayeux, speaks nothing but stones and bullets; who, in a whole volume, hath freely painted out the corrupt estate of the Church: neither did Dominicus, bishop of Brixia, speak any whit more sparingly; who, even in those times, durst set before his book this title, "The Reformation of Rome." To say nothing of Joachim, of Peter of Ferrara the lawyer; of the three Theodoricks; of Lyra, Petrarch, Gerson, Everard the Bishop of Saltzburg, Erasmus, Cassander, Espencæus, the jury of cardinals selected by Paul the Third, (amongst which, Gasper Contarini, James Sadolet, and our cardinal Pole were, as they might, of eminent note,) Alvarus Pelagius, Savonarola of Florence, and whomsoever those times yielded at once both learned and good. Even pope Adrian himself, the sixth of that name, while he instructs his legate in his message censures the Church, and ingenuously complains that all was gone to wreck and ruin.

What shall we then say to this? Can any man be so partial as to think that so many saints of both sexes, prophets, prophetesses, monks, doctors, cardinals, popes, should, as Jerome speaks of the Luciferian heretics, merely devise these slanders to the disgrace of their holy mother? If any man can be so mad, he is well worthy to be ever deceived.

Indeed, Rome was once *an holy city*, Matt. iv. 5; but now, as no less famous the other way, she is become *a city of blood*, Ezek. xxiv. 6. 9. This grape is grown a dry raisin. Neither did that good hermit, Antony, so justly say of his Alexandria as we may now of Rome; "Woe to thee, thou strumpetly city, into

which the devils out of all the rest of the world have assembled themselves."

Certainly, therefore, so shameful and general a deformity could not but be discerned by our latter papists; and, to avoid all shifts, we have gently and lovingly laid our finger upon these spots. But in the mean time, how heinously have they taken it! and, as Ruffinus speaks of Apollinaris the heretic, while they are transported with the vicious humour of contention, and will be crossing every thing that is spoken, out of the vain ostentation of a strong wit, they have improved their idle brabbles to heresies. Jerome said wittily, "They use to wink and deny which believe not that to be done which they would not have done."

It is therefore a most lamentable and fearful case, that a church, which of her own favourites is justly accused of many and dangerous errors, should block up against herself the way whereby she should return into the truth, and, as Francis à Victoria honestly complains, should neither endure her own evils nor their remedies. For while she stands upon it that she cannot err, and stubbornly challenges unto her chair a certain impeccancy of judgment, that we may borrow a word from Tertullian, what hope can now remain of recovering the truth? How are we now too saucy that dare mutter aught against her! The first hope of health must needs be fetched from the sense and acknowledgment of the disease. That of Epicure is common and true; "The beginning of recovery is the knowledge of the fault." "Thou must find thyself amiss," saith Seneca, "ere thou canst amend thyself." Rome brags that she cannot be sick: what do we now talk of medicines for her? These doctrinal principles, as our Stapleton calls them, are they from which a certain fatal necessity of erring must needs follow.

For to what purpose is all this we do? If upon the sentence of this Romish Oracle (for in the closet, or prison rather, of his breast, as Jerome objected to John of Jerusalem, the Church is included) all things do so depend that, whatsoever he shall determine must be received without all contradiction, and his decree can by no inferior means be repealed; in vain do we wrangle for truth; in vain have all those former synods both met and defined; in vain do we either teach or learn aught of any other master. Is it possible she should ever be drawn to remorse for her error which eagerly defends that she cannot err? Either, therefore,

let our papists suffer this vain opinion of infallibility to be pulled up by the very roots out of their breasts, or else there can be no hope so much as of a consultation of peace.

And do we think that our masters beyond the Alps will ever abide themselves stripped of this darling which they have made so dainty of all this while? Why do we not as well demand St. Peter's throne and his revenues, and, together with his patrimony, all the body of religion? For what one tittle is there of the now Roman faith that hangs not on this string? Let them give us this, and Rome falls alone, and lies shamefully in the dust. Let them deny it us, and she shall be still that great harlot, still an enemy to peace, still hateful to Heaven. But so far are their modern doctors from an ingenuous rejection of infallibility, that no age ever knew so well how to flatter a pope. For not only have some yielded this unto him without a council, as Albert Pighius, Gretser, Bellarmine, and all Jesuits wheresoever, but some others, as Gregory of Valentia, have fastened this upon him without any care or study required on his part. O happy chair of Peter, firm, eternal, full of prodigious virtue! which, if we might imagine a wooden one, I should sure think were made of Irish oak—there is no spider of error can touch it but presently dies. Behold the tables written with God's own hand were soon broken and gone, but the bars of thy frame can feel no age, cannot incur the danger of any miscarriage. Sure I think Vibius Rufus is alive again which because he sat in the same seat wherein Julius Cæsar had sat, and married Cicero's wife, had wont to vaunt of both; as if he should sure be Cæsar for his seat, or for his wife Cicero. Belike all the virtue of it is from Peter. It is well that his other successors conferred nothing towards it, lest perhaps Alexander the Sixth should have turned the succeeding popes into lechers; Clement, into sacrilegious church-robbers; Julius, into swaggerers; Benedict, Gregory, Sylvester, into simonists; Paschalis, into perjurers; Pope Joan of Mentz, into women; Martin, and that other Sylvester, into magicians; the two Johns, into devils incarnate.

Now, on the other part, can any man be so foolish to hope that our Church will ever be so mad as thus basely to bolster up the great bridge-maker of Tiber; as though we could be ignorant how Christ never either performed or promised them any such privilege? For where is it written, as Luther jested well, unless perhaps at Rome, in St. Peter's, upon some chimney, with a coal?

Christ said indeed, *Thou art Peter*, Matt. xvi. 18; but "Thou art Paul the Fifth," he never said. He said, *I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not*, Matt. xxvi. 32; so he said too, *Go behind me, Satan; thou savourest not the things of God*, Matt. xvi. 23. Now let this oracle of the chair teach us how he can at once make himself full heir of the promise and yet shift off the censure at pleasure.

Yet, to tread in the steps of the times, as though we could not know that the following ages knew not of this; not Polycrates and Irenæus, which resisted Victor the pope; not Cyprian, which opposed Stephen; not the Fathers of Chalcedon, which would not yield to Leo; not the eastern bishops, which would not yield to Julius; nor the Fathers of Constantinople, which refused to yield to Vigilius and Honorius; yea, of the later divines, those which have had either sense or shame, as John Gerson, chancellor of Paris, Turrecremata, Almaine, Alphonsus de Castro, pope Adrian the Sixth, archbishop Catharinus, cardinal Cajetan, Francisus à Victoria, and who not, of the best rank of their doctors, have not feared openly to deny and disclaim this fancy. And Alphonsus shall give a reason thereof for all: "There are many unlearned popes," saith he, "that know not so much as the rules of grammar: how then should they be able to interpret the holy Scriptures?"

As though we knew not which of their popes favoured Arius, which Montanus, which Nestorius, which Acacius, which the Monothelites, which the Sadducees, and which were in league with devils; which of them have defined contrary to their fellows, and which contrary to God; and, that I may use Jerome's words, how silly a pilot hath oftentimes steered the leaking vessel of the Church!

As though every tapster and tinker nowadays could not point their finger to the long beadroll of popes, and say, "Such and such were the monsters of men: such," as Platina, Lyra, Genebrard confess, "were apotactical and apostatical miscreants." Ywis their life hath been long the table-talk of the world, as Bernard speaks.

There can therefore be no peace possible unless they will be content to be headless, or we can be content to be the slaves of Rome. Imagine they could be so ingenuous as to confess that the same serpent which insinuated himself of old into paradise, might perhaps creep closely into Peter's chair; yet

there would be no less controversy *de facto* than of the possibility of error.

Besides, there are other popish opinions of the same stamp, but more pragmatical, which are not more pernicious to the Church than to commonweals; as those of the power of both swords, of the deposition of princes, disposition of kingdoms, absolving of subjects, frustration of oaths, (sufficiently canvassed of late, both by the Venetian divines and French, and ours,) which are so palpably opposite to the liberty of Christian government, that those princes and people which can stoop to such a yoke are well worthy of their servitude.

And can they hope that the great commanders of the world will come to this bent? "We all," as the comic poet said truly, "had rather be free than serve;" but much more princes. Or, on the contrary, can we hope that the tyrants of the Church will be content to leave this hold? What a foppery were this! For both those princes are grown more wise and these tyrants more arrogant, and, as Ruffinus speaks of George the Arian gallant, they insolently govern an usurped bishopric, as if they thought they had the managing of a proud empire and not of a religious priesthood.

SECT. VI.—*That the other Opinions of the Romish Church will not admit reconciliation.*

But let us be so liberal as to grant this to ourselves which certainly they will never grant us; for this old grandam of cities thinks herself born to command, and will either fall or rule. Neither doth that mitred moderator of the world affect any other emblem than that which Julian jestingly ascribes to Julius Cæsar, τὸ πρωτεύειν, "to rule all;" or to Alexander the Great, πάντα νικᾶν, "to conquer all." It was a degenerating spirit of Adrian the Sixth which caused to be written upon his tomb in the church of St. Peter, "That nothing in all his life fell out so unhappily to him as that he governed." Let this, I say, be granted us.

There want not, I know, some milder spirits, (Theodosians, that can play with both hands,) which think, if these busy points were by the moderation of both parts quietly composed, it might be safe for any man, so it be without noise, to think what he list concerning the other differences of religion.

These are the ghosts of that heretic Apelles, whose speech it was, That it is sufficient to believe in Christ crucified, and that there should be no discussing of the particular warrants and

reason of our faith; or the brood of Leonas, one of the courtiers of Constantius, and his deputy in the Seleucian Council, which, when the Fathers hotly contended, as there was good cause, for the consubstantiality of the Son, "Get you home," said he, "and trouble not the Church still with these trifles."

St. Basil was of another mind from these men, who, as Theodoret reports, when the lieutenant of Valens the emperor persuaded him to remit but one letter for peace-sake, answered, "Those that are nursed with the sincere milk of God's word may not abide one syllable of his sacred truth to be corrupted, but rather than they will endure it are ready to receive any kind of torment or death."

Eleusius and Silvanus, which were orthodox bishops, and those other worthy guardians, and, as Athanasius's title was, champions of the truth, were of another mind from these cool and indifferent mediators.

So far as the sacred truth will allow us, we will accompany them gladly; but if they urge us farther, we stand still or start back. And those two courses, which Epiphanius advised as the remedies of heresy, *heed* and *avoidance*, both those do we carefully use and perform. Great is the offence of discord, and unexpiable, and such, in the grave judgment of Cyprian, as is not purged with the blood of our passion. And justly do we think that fiend of Homer worthy of no place but hell. But yet we cannot think concord a meet price of truth, which it is lawful for us to buy at any rate, but to sell upon any terms is no less than piacular.

Let us therefore a little discuss the several differences, and, as it uses to be done when the house is too little for the stuff, let us pile up all close together. It shall be enough in this large harvest of matter to gather some few ears out of every shock, and to make a compendious despatch of so long a task.

The grossest of the popish heresies, and, as Jerome objects to Origen, the most venomous opinions of Rome, which have bred so much trouble and danger at this day to the Church of God, are either such as do concern ourselves, not without some respect to God or such as concern God, not without some respect to us.

Of the former sort are those which in a certain order (such as it is) of discourse are conversant about justification, freewill, the merit of our works, human satisfaction, indulgences, purgatory, and the differences of mortal and venial sins.

These therefore first offer themselves to our examination.

SECT. VII.—*The Romish Heresy concerning Justification.*

That point of *justification*, of all other, is exceeding important, insomuch as Calvin was fain to persuade, that if this one head might be yielded safe and entire, it would not quit the cost to make any great quarrel for the rest.

Would to God that word of Cassander might be made good which doubted not to say, "That which is affirmed, that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works, but that they are freely justified by faith, was always allowed and received in the Church of God, and is at this day approved by all ecclesiastical writers."

Yea, I would they would be ruled by their Thomas Aquinas in this, who attributes justification to works; not as justification is taken for an infusion of grace, but as it is taken for an exercise, or manifestation, or consummation of justice. If this were all, in this point all would be peace.

But whilst the Tridentine Fathers take upon them to forge the formal cause of our justification to be our own inherent justice, and thrust faith out of office; what good man can choose but presently address himself to an opposition? Who would not rather die than suffer the ancient faith of the Church to be depraved with these idle dreams?

Go, now, ye great Trent divines, and brag of yourselves, as Aëtius did of old, by Theodoret's report, that God hath now, at last, revealed to you those things which he would have hitherto concealed from all the world.

In the mean time we cannot but scorn to see the souls of men so shamefully deluded, while we hear the Spirit of God so often redoubling—*without works—not by works, but by faith—by their works no flesh shall be justified—being justified freely by his grace*, Rom. iv. 6; Gal. ii. 16; Eph. ii. 8; Rom. iii. 20, 24. By the power whereof, Arias Montanus, an ingenuous author (and, as Jerome said of Apollinarius, a man of approved labour, though in many things, as the times then were, faulty in opinion), being utterly convinced, "It follows," saith he, "that faith is reputed for righteousness to him that works not in the law, and that, according to the purpose of the grace of God."

If we cast our eyes back to the ancient Fathers, they are all ours: "Not according to the worth of our works," saith Basil: "Only to believe," saith Nazianzen: "Faith alone is sufficient,"

saith Jerome: "By believing are men justified," saith Augustin. And with these consort the rest; Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Athanasius, Ambrose, Primasius, and that whole sacred choir of antiquity. But to what purpose do I instance in these, when as the Expurgatory Index of Spain hath purposely wiped both out of the tables and text of Chrysostom, Jerome, Cyril, most clear testimonies for the sole justification by faith? The book is everywhere abroad: it is needless to recite the severals. See now the inquisitors guilty to themselves both of error and fraud. To whom I must sing the same note that Ambrose did of old to the Arians: "Ye may blot out the letters, but the faith you can never abolish: those blurs bewray you more, those blots condemn you more than the writing."

But some perhaps may think this a mere strife of words, and not hard to be reconciled; for that which to the papists is inherent justice, is no other to the protestants than sanctification; both sides hold this equally necessary, both call for it equally. True, but do both require it in the same manner? do both to the same end? I think not. Yea, what can be more contrary than these opinions to each other? The papists make this inherent righteousness the cause of our justification; the protestants, the effect thereof. The protestants require it as the companion or page; the papists, as the usher, yea, rather as the parent of justification.

"But what matters it," say they, "so both ascribe this whole work to God? as though it comes not all to one to pay a sum for me, and to give it me to pay for myself?" I know not how these things seem so little dissonant to these men's ears which the Spirit of God hath made utterly incompatible: *To him that worketh, the wages is not imputed of grace, but of debt*, Rom. iv. 4: *If by grace, now not of works; or else grace should be no more grace*, Rom. xi. 6: "For neither is it grace any way if it be not free every way," saith Augustin. But these men say, "Therefore of grace because of works."

Not of works, lest any man should boast, saith the Spirit, Eph. ii. 9: "But of works, and yet a man shall boast in the Lord," saith Bellarmine. And wherefore shall he boast? because he is just? because void of sin? Perhaps some Isidore may say thus of himself, which voluntarily protested that for forty years' space he found not in himself any sin, not so much as in his

thought, not so much as any consent to anger or inordinate desire. Or perhaps, some Baronius or Bellarmine may report this of their late St. Gonzaga; or the offal of the schools may say so of Bonaventure, in whom, if we believe them, Adam sinned not; or Manichæus may say it of his elect masters; or, perhaps, Priscillian, Evagrius, Jovinian, the Messalians, may brag thus of themselves.

But far otherwise is that speech of Ambrose; "I will not boast because I am just, but because I am redeemed; I will boast, not because I am void of sin, but because my sins are forgiven me." Otherwise we shall come to that point which Innocentius condemned in the Pelagians, "What need have we now of God?"

But thou sayest, "God hath given me this whereby I am just." Indeed this seems at the first a great and glorious praise of the grace of God, and at the first hearing sounds well to an ignorant ear; and yet, when it is better considered, under a pretence of piety spoils Christ of his glory. Why dost thou not as well say, "He hath given me wherewith I may redeem myself?" for by the same wherewith we are justified we are redeemed, *being justified by his blood*, Rom. v. 9. Behold, the blood of him that is God and man justifies us, and the same redeems us.

But go on a little: God hath given thee this. But hath he given it thee without thyself? Is this done without the intervention, without the operation of our free will? Let the monks of Bourdeaux speak in their abjurations; let Andradius, let Bellarmine (the flower of the popish school), let any papist deny this if he dare.

It is only Christ's therefore which is imputed; that which is inherent is ours. "For all," saith Austin, "which are justified by Christ are just, not in themselves, but in him. That which is Christ's, because it is his, is most perfect; that which is ours, because ours, is weak and imperfect. God hath made us men, not gods. Our perfection is seasonable in heaven."

Justly doth Jerome deride Ctesiphon; we, the papists: "O blessed, O happy men, if that justice which is not thought to be anywhere but in heaven may be found with you only upon earth!" In the mean time it is sufficient for us to mourn for our wants, to hate our injustice. It is the very speech of Donatists, "I have nothing for thee to pardon."

Let Bernard now, to conclude, shut up this stage: "Not to

sin," saith he, "is God's justice; but the justice of man is the pardon of God."

To be imputed therefore, and to be inherent, differ no less than God and man, Trent and Heaven. Wherefore let our Romanists confess that which both Scriptures and Fathers and all their modester doctors have both thought and reported to be the common voice of the former Church in all times, and we are agreed; otherwise, what fellowship hath God with Belial, light with darkness?

SECT. VIII.—*Concerning Freewill.*

Bordering upon this is the point of *freewill*.

To let pass all lighter quarrels of the nature of our will, let us inquire of the power of it; and that, not in natural, human, or moral things, (here is all peace and silence, save that the words jangle with themselves; and, when the matter is agreed upon, who would not contemn words, as Augustin saith well?) but in spiritual and divine matters.

We do will indeed. We will freely; neither can we otherwise will any thing. Who denies it? Here is no physical determination, no violence; but to will that which is good, or to will well, we cannot. We do freely believe, for faith is an act of the will; yea, and we do cooperate with grace; neither are we herein like to senseless stones, as Austin truly speaks.

But whence is all this? Is it of ourselves or of God? Is it of grace, or, which the council of Arausica condemned, by the power of nature? This must be our question.

Both sides like well that speech of St. Augustin: "To will freely is the work of nature; to will well, of grace; to will ill, of corruption:" but when we come to the point, the doctors of Trent are not more subtle than the Jesuits inconstant.

It is yet good and safe, which Bellarmine cites from his Ruardus: "A good work, as it is a work, is from freewill; as it is good, from grace; as both a work and good, both from freewill and grace."

But that is exceeding ingenuous and truly evangelical which the same Bellarmine affirms against some Semipelagian catholics in those things which pertain to piety and salvation, that man's will can do nothing without the help of God's grace. It is the voice of Jacob. If the cardinal would hold him there, cursed be he that should oppose him.

I go on to hope and read ; and see what stuff I meet with soon after in the same book : That our conversion is in the power of our freewill, because it may be always converted when it will : and yet further ; That, before all grace, we have freewill, even in the works of piety and supernatural things. Before all grace ? what ! before the grace of prevention ? It were well the cardinal would set forth some better recognitions.

Now then, God doth not prevent us, as Austin said of old, that we might will ; but we prevent God, because we will.

But lest this should seem too gross, this liberty is tied up, and is altogether in the same state as the faculty of seeing when a sensible species is absent : we can freely see while the object is absent ; we can freely will in the absence of grace.

Let Bellarmine now tell me, are we any whit more free to evil than he feigns us to good ? Did ever Pelagius dote thus much ? We can will evil ; but yet, unless it be determined under some false semblance, by the verdict of our practical judgment we will it not.

But, if we should yield him thus much, what help is this that God gives us ? To prevent, inspire, excite, and help, is of God ; to incline the will is of ourselves. How are we not now more beholden to ourselves than to God ? What is this but that Pelagian conceit so oft condemned by Augustin, so to separate freewill from grace, as if without it we could do or think any thing answerable to the will of God ?

That we are able by the power of our will to avoid sins ; that we can overcome " the slighter motions of temptation," as Bellarmine speaks ; that we can keep God's commandments, as Scotus and Durandus ; that we can reject or receive the inspiration of the Spirit, as the Tridentine Fathers ; that we can dispose ourselves to the receiving of grace, as Thomas and Suarez ; that we do naturally cooperate with grace, and make our conversion effectual, as Tapperus ; what is it else, but to steal glory from God, that we may prank up this carrion-nature of ours ?

Yet it was modestly done of Tiberius, who, of those many buildings which he repaired and perfected, challenged not one to himself, but gave them still the names of those men, by whom they were begun to be built ; but these men challenge the whole house, whenas they have not laid so much as one tile upon the roof.

Far be this shameful sacrilege from us, when that truly jealous

God challenges to himself to work in us both the will and the deed; yea, that we can will to believe is his work; as Austin rightly speaks. See, then, he doth not excite, but work in us, *ἐνεργεῖ*: He works in us both that which is first, to will, and that which is last, to work, Phil. ii. 13.

Jerome says worthily, "To will and to run is mine, but without God's continual help it will not be mine." *Without me, ye can do nothing*, saith Christ, John xv. 5; no, *not think any thing*, saith Paul, 2 Cor. iii. 5. Alas! what can we do, who are not lame, but *dead in sins*? Ephes. ii. 1. By the influence of God's Spirit therefore a new life must be created in us that was not, and not the former life excited, Col. iii. 1, which was; according to that of the Psalmist, *Create in me a clean heart*, Psalm li. 10, and not, Stir up that clean one I have. Neither indeed is there as yet any place for this; the first heart must be taken out, another must be put in: *I will take away their stony heart, and give them an heart of flesh*, saith God, by the mouth of Ezekiel, chap. xxxvi. 26.

"He will give it, but," thou sayest perhaps, "into their breasts which have predisposed and prepared themselves for the gift;" yea contrarily, to those which do not a little resist him. The wisdom of the flesh is enmity: but there are some enmities more secret, and which do not outwardly bewray themselves; but, behold, here is public resistance, *οὐκ ὑποτάσσεται*, *it is not subject*, Rom. viii. 7.

"But perhaps it will once yield of itself:" *οὐ δύναται*, *It cannot*, saith the Spirit of God, Rom. viii. 7.

See in how rebellious an estate we are to God. What proneness is here to will good? what ability to perform it?

Let the papists, if they will, sacrifice to themselves, as Sejanus had wont of old, or to their nets, as the Prophet speaketh. As for us, come what can come upon our opposition, we neither can nor dare arrogate unto ourselves those things which by an holy reservation and incommunicableness, are proper only to the Highest.

It is safe indeed for the papists, when they will, to come up to us, but we cannot go down to them without a fearful precipitation of our souls. Let Cassander witness this for us; let Bonaventure himself witness it for him: "This is the property of holy minds, to attribute nothing to themselves, but all to the grace of God: so that how much soever a man ascribe to the

grace of God, he swerveth not from true piety; though, by giving much to grace, he withdraw something from the power of nature or freewill: but when any thing is withdrawn from the grace of God, and aught attributed to nature which is due to grace, there may be great danger to the soul." Thus far those two ingenuous papists.

But to infer; we give all to grace, the papists something to nature; and what they give to nature we give to God. Therefore we do and say that which is fit for holy minds; they, if Bonaventure may be witness, that which swerves from piety, and is joined with much danger of their soul.

SECT. IX.—*Concerning Merits.*

The foundation of popish justification is the freedom of our will, and upon the walls of justification is *merit* raised.

We will have no quarrel about the word. The holy Fathers of old, as we all grant, took the word in a good sense which the later divines have miscrably corrupted.

About the thing itself we must strive eternally. We promise a reward to good works, yea, an everlasting one. It is a true word of the Jews, "He that labours on the even shall eat on the sabbath:" for God hath promised it, and will perform: who yet *crowneth us in mercy and compassion*, as the Psalmist speaks, Ps. ciii. 4; not as the papists, "in the rigour of justice;" not as Andradius, "according to the due desert of our work:" "by the free gift of God, and not our merits," as Cajetan, wisely and worthily; or if any man like that word better, "God doth it in justice, but in respect of his own promise, not the very dignity of our works."

"That a just man's work in the truth of the thing itself is of a value worthy of the reward of heaven," which industrious and learned Morton cites out of the English professor of Doway; "and hath a meet proportion both of equality and dignity to the recompense of eternal life," as Pererius; "and that in itself, without any respect of the merits and death of Christ," which Suarez and Bayus shamed not to write, seems justly to us little less than blasphemy.

"But," say our moderate papists, "Christ hath merited this merit of ours;" "neither can any other works challenge this to themselves but those which are done in God," as Andradius speaks; "but those which are dipped and dyed in the blood of

Christ," as our later papists elegantly and emphatically speak. But what is this but to cozen the world, and to cast a mist before the eyes of the unskilful? Our sins are dyed in the blood of Christ, not our merits; or if they also, hath Christ then deserved that our works should be perfect? How comes it about that the works of the best men are so lame and defective? Hath he deserved that though they be imperfect yet they might merit? What injury is this to God! what contradiction of terms!

Behold now so many saviours as good men! What I do is mine, what I merit is mine, whosoever gives me either to do or to merit.

Whosoever rides on a lame horse cannot but move unevenly, unceasingly, uncertainly. What insolent overweeners of their own works are these papists, which proclaim the actions which proceed from themselves worthy of no less than heaven! to whom we may justly say, as Constantine said to Acesius the Novatian, "Set up ladders, O ye papists, and climb up to heaven alone."

Who can abide that noted speech of Bellarmine, "A just man hath by a double title right to the same glory; one, by the merits of Christ imparted to him by grace; another, by his own merits?" contrary to that of the Spirit of God, *The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life*. Upon which words another cardinal, Cajetan, speaks in a holier fashion thus: "He doth not say that the wages of our righteousness is eternal life, but, *the gift of God is eternal life*; that we may understand and learn that we attain eternal life, not by our own merits, but by the free gift of God: for which cause also he adds, *by Jesus Christ our Lord*, Rom. vi. 23. Behold the merit, behold the righteousness whose wages is eternal life; but to us, in respect of Jesus Christ, it is a free gift." Thus Cajetan. What could either Luther or Calvin or any protestant say more plainly?

How imperfect doth the Scripture everywhere proclaim both God's graces in us and our works to him! and though the graces of God were absolutely perfect, yet they are not ours: if our works were so, yet they are formerly due: and if they be due to God, what recompense of transcendent glory is due to us? Behold, we are both servants and unprofitable. *Not worthy*, saith God; "worthy, and more," say the papists. *By grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves*, saith God, Eph. ii. 8: "By grace indeed, but yet of ourselves," say the papists. What insolency is this! Let our monks now go and

profess wilful poverty, while Hezekiah did never so boast of his heaps of treasure as these of their spiritual wealth.

Jerome said truly, "It is more hard to be stripped of our pride than of our gold and jewels; for even when those outward ornaments are gone, many times these inward rags swell up the soul."

Gregory Ariminensis, their old schoolman, was ashamed of this wicked arrogance, and so was Durandus, and Pighius, and other their divines of a more modest temper. I would the Jesuits could have had the grace to have been no less ashamed, and the Tridentine doctors, together with their executioners, the inquisitors.

But what other men have holily and truly spoken, that they have perfidiously wiped out. Witness their Index of Madrid, in these words: "Out of the book which is intituled, The Order of Baptizing, together with the Manner of Visiting the Sick, printed at Venice, in the year 1575, let these words be blotted out: 'Dost thou believe that, not by thine own merits, but by the virtue and merit of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, thou shalt come to glory?'" And soon after: "'Dost thou believe that our Lord Jesus Christ died for our salvation, and that no man can be saved by his own merits, or any other means, but only by the merit of his passion?'"

Ywis, these are the scorpions and snakes of the ancient divines, as Jerome termed the errors of Origen, amongst which the reader must needs have walk'd, had not the grave senate of the inquisition wisely provided for our safety.

What hope is there now of peace? unless they could be content, (which Bellarmine grants to be the safest way,) renouncing the merits of their works, not so much for their uncertainty as the imperfection of their justice and danger of vainglory, both to resolve and teach men, to repose their whole confidence in the mercy and bounty of God, which we can at once both wish and not hope for.

SECT. X.—*Concerning Satisfaction.*

Satisfaction hath near affinity with merit, and indeed is but as another twig arising from the same root; than which no opinion could be devised more injurious and reproachful to the merits of Christ.

The word was not displeasing to the ancient Fathers, nor in their sense to us. Only this let me touch in passing by: That the heedless abuses of words, to the great wrong of the Church, hath bred confusion of things: as contrarily that of Tertullian is approved; "The assured sense of words is the safety of proprieties."

We have nothing to do here with civil satisfaction, nothing with ecclesiastical; whereof Luther not unfitly said, even in Cassander's own judgment, "Our mother, the Church, out of her good affection, desiring to prevent the hand of God, chastises her children with certain satisfactions, lest they should fall under the scourges of God." This canonical satisfaction, as many call it, hath been too long out of use on both sides.

Yea, more than this; in all our sermons to our people, we beat importunately upon the necessity of penitence and all the wholesome exercises thereof as fruits worthy of repentance; not, as Cassander well interprets it, as if we desired they should offer unto God a ransom worthy and sufficient for the clearing of the score of their sins, but that we teach them those offices must be performed by them which God requires of those sinners on whom he will bestow the satisfaction of his Son.

Let them call these *satisfactions* if they will; we give them leave. But that after the most absolute passion of Christ there should be yet behind certain remainders of punishment to be discharged by us, either here or in purgatory, with a purpose thereby to satisfy the divine justice, whether they be imposed by God or by the priest or by ourselves, as the Tridentine distinction runs, we neither may nor can endure.

For how nicely soever these men distinguish, it cannot be but this sacrilegious opinion must needs accuse the truly propitiatory sacrifice of Christ of some imperfection. I know they say that both satisfactions may well stand together—that of the Mediator and this of man; whereof Bonaventure calls the one perfect, the other semi-perfect. But these are words. Let the sophisters tell me, Doth not the full vessel contain in itself the half? or what need the one half apart when we have the whole? and lastly, can any thing be added to that which is perfect?

But some of their heedfuller divines will neither have these two opposite nor subordinate to each other. For it is a shame to speak what Suarez, what Durand, and other grosser papists have discoursed of this point. Let them rather, if they will, hold (which

opinion yet hath been controlled, not by the cardinal only, but by three popes before him) that men's satisfactions serve only to apply unto us that which the satisfactions of Christ have promerited for us. Yet even this shift will not serve: for Christ's satisfaction, as they teach, respects eternal punishment and not temporal. How then can it once be imagined, that we, by our satisfaction, should procure that his suffering which was destined to the expiation of an eternal punishment should serve to the discharge of a temporal? And why should we do this rather than Christ himself? Besides, how absurdly doth this sound, that He whose bounty hath paid our pounds for us hath yet left us out of our poor stock to pay some few farthings for ourselves!

Let me demand then; Whether could not Christ undertake these temporal punishments for us, or would he not? That he could not, is impious; that he would not, is bold to say, and illiberal to do. For where is there any restraint? or what are the limits of his mercy?

"The fault is remitted," saith the Conventicle of Trent: "the punishment is not pardoned." The Eastern Church would never have said so, which always stoutly opposed herself to this error. And indeed what a shameful reproach is this to the infinite mercy of the Forgiver! what a wrong to his justice! Whereto is the punishment due but to the fault? Did ever God inflict punishments that were not due? Many a time hath he forgiven to sinners those plagues which both they had deserved and he threatened: but never did he call back for those arrearages which he had forgiven.

God punishes us indeed, or chastens us rather, and that sometimes well and sharply, after the remission of our offence, not that he may give himself satisfaction of us, for how can it be so pleasing to him that it should be ill with us? but that he may confirm us to himself, that he may amend us. He lays no stroke upon us with a revenging hand, but with a fatherly.

We suffer therefore now, but we satisfy not. This is proper only to that eternal Priest and to his eternal priesthood; and is no more communicable to saints and angels than his own person. And certainly that which was his part he hath performed; he hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law; and part of the legal punishment is this temporal revenge.

For us therefore to give hands to them in this, it were no better than perfidious and shamefully traitorous. And if it be more

than manifest that this cannot be done either by our own torments inflicted or good works performed (how penal soever), how much less shall it be effected by others' ! There is none of the saints which will not justly take up that answer of the wiser virgins, *There will not be enough for you and for us*, Matt. xxv. 9. But, as Jerome said well, "There is no need of any great conviction where the opinion carries blasphemy in the face."

SECT. XI.—*Concerning Purgatory.*

Upon this conceit of satisfactions depend those other fables of *purgatory* and indulgences; pleasant ones both, and not unworthy of a satire; whereof so oft as I think, I cannot but remember the scornful frump of Luther, alluding to that of the prophet, *Domine, non possum vesci stercore humano*, Ezek. iv. 14.

Yet, if they had only doubtfully and problematically commended their purgatory to the Church, we might easily have favoured them with a connivance; although you cannot say whether it would have been more worthy to set the spleen on work for laughter or the bowels for commiseration. But now, when Bellarmine teaches us that it pertains to the catholic faith, and our Fisher of Rochester will have it altogether necessary to be known and believed, we cannot entertain this presumptuous folly without indignation.

How miserably the Scriptures are wrested to this purpose if any schoolboy could not easily see, he were worthy of whipping. As Jerome said of the heretics of his time, "They frame some unfitting testimonies to their own sense: as if it were a worthy, and not rather an abominable kind of teaching, to deprave sentences, and to drag the Scriptures perforce to their own bent."

Neither are the ancient Fathers better used in their citation: of which Origen, Ambrose, Hilary, Lactantius, Nyssen, Jerome, gave intimation of a quite other purgatory from the Romish. Augustine speaks of it at peradventure, waveringly, uncertainly. The rest never dreamed of any at all.

But yet I mistake it. Now I remember, St. Plato is cited by Austin and Eusebius for the patron of this opinion, and who knows not that St. Homer and St. Virgil are flat for it?

Yet this fire never began to burn out but in Gregory's time; and since that, the authority of the Alcoran hath not a little mended it.

This is it that their Rochester ingenuously confessed of old, that this purgatory flame came but lately to the knowledge of

the Church: but for us, that of St. Paul shall never be wrung from our hands; 'Εὐνὴ ἐπίγειος, *If or when this earthly house shall be dissolved, we have a building not made with hands, eternal in the heavens*, 2 Cor. v. 1. And when is this St. Paul's εὐν? St. John shall interpret it: ἀποθνήσκοντες ἀνδρῶν, *those that die, a modo, from henceforth*, Apoc. xiv. 13. And when is this a modo? *To-day thou shalt be with me*, saith Christ; Luke xxiii. 43, even instantly upon the egress of the soul. Let them commend their souls to God, saith St. Peter, 1 Pet. iv. 19.

But what of that? That which doth utterly quench out this fabulous fire, the counterfeit Solomon (though true to the papists) adds, "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no torment shall touch them;" Wisd. iii. 1. Behold then either the souls without a purgatory, or a purgatory without pain.

But what stick we at this? Let the popish doctors go together and agree among themselves of the fire of their purgatory, of the torments of the subject, of the duration, of the executioners, of the condition of the souls there detained; and then afterwards let them look for our assent.

In the mean time, why is it not as free for us as for Suarez not to believe the walking ghosts of the dead but metaphorically? or why may not we as well deny the ordinary common purgatory as Bellarmine may devise a new one, more noble and easeful than the first?

SECT. XII.—Concerning Pardons.

Purgatory is guilty of *indulgences*, as their Rochester confesses. Both of them were bred by superstition and nursed by covetousness. I touch these with a light hand only.

It is long since all ingenuous clients of Rome were ashamed of this holy fraud.

I cannot but commend Cassander, which writes thus modestly and truly: "The abatement or relaxation of canonical punishment was of old called *indulgence*; which at this day is drawn to all private satisfactions, and the full right of bestowing them withdrawn from all other bishops to the bishop of Rome alone. About the use and practice whereof all good men have desired a correction and moderation, as of things which being hitherto ill handled, have given the chief occasion of this breach in the Church. Here therefore it were to be wished that the popes would yield something to the public peace." Thus far Cassander. With whom agrees Polydore Virgil, both of them more worthy

of a black coal than their honest Rochester whom Gregory of Valence hath so foully branded. Neither have there wanted some of their own, as Bellarmine witnesseth, which have called both the treasure of the Church and pardons into question. Neither have there wanted those which have boldly and flatly denied them either to be of use or to be at all.

And indeed who that is not too much intoxicate with the potions of that harlot can endure that, whilst the imputation of Christ's merits to the justifying of a sinner applied by God to us is everywhere a common scoffing-stock to these men, yet that the merits and sufferings of holy men, out of a certain common treasure, should by a man be imputed to men for the deliverance of their souls from torment?

Who can abide that any mortal man should over-satisfy God for his sins?

Who can abide the prodigal grants and shameful marts of their pardons?

Who can endure to hear that to the careless mumbling over of some short prayers (for if we believe their casuists there is no great need of any intention of mind, of any special devotion) there should be granted by John XXII a pardon for no less than a million of years?

Who can endure, since by their own confession this fire must last but till the conflagration of the world, that yet in one little book there should be tendered unto credulous poor souls pardons of but eleven thousand thousand of years? What should we make many words of this? There is now lying by me a wormeaten manuscript, with fair rubrics, in which, beside other absurd and blasphemous promises, there is power given to one little prayer to change the pains of hell—due perhaps to him that says it—into purgatory; and after that again, the pains of purgatory into the joys of heaven. Bellarmine had wisely respected his own credit if he had given his voice according to that which he confesseth to have been the judgment of some others; that these-like bulls were not given by the popes, but lewdly devised by some of his base questuaries for an advantage. But that which he should excuse he defends. What ingenuity or shame is to be expected of Jesuits? and how clean hath an old parrot, as he said of old, forgotten the wand!

Who may abide this unjust and inhuman acceptance of persons? that the wealthier sort may by their purses redeem this

holy treasure of the Church, and by money deliver the souls of themselves and their friends from this horrible prison, while the needy soul must be still frying in that flame, without all hope of pardon, or mature relaxation, until the very last judgment day?

Lastly, who can endure, that while it is in the power of Christ's Vicar to call miserable souls out of this tormenting fire, which hell itself is said to exceed only in the continuance; yet that he should suffer them to lie howling there, and most cruelly broiling still, and not mercifully bestow on them all the heaps of his treasure, as the spiritual ransom of so many distressed spirits? A wretched man is he, as Ambrose said of the rich man, which hath the power to deliver so many souls from death, and wants the will. Why hath God given him this faculty of indulgences, if he would not have it beneficial to mankind? And where the owner of the house will be bountiful, it is not for the steward to be niggardly. Let that Circe of Rome keep these husks for her hogs.

SECT. XIII.—*Concerning the distinction of mortal and venial Sin.*

Pardons do both imply and presuppose that known distinction of *mortal and venial sin*; which neither hath God ever allowed, neither, while he gainsays it, will ever the protestants.

That there are certain degrees of evil, we both acknowledge and teach: so as we may here justly tax the dishonesty and shamelessness of Campion, Dureus, Coccius, and the monks of Bourdeaux, who have upbraided us with the opinion of a certain stoical and Jovinianish parity of sins; yea, Bellarmine himself hath already done this kind office for us.

Some offences are more heinous than other; yet all, in the malignity of their nature, deadly: as of poisons, some kill more gently and lingeringly, others more violently and speedily; yet both kill.

Moreover, if we have respect unto the infinite mercy of God, and to the object of this mercy, the penitent and faithful heart, there is no sin which, to borrow the word of Prudentius, is not venial; but in respect of the anomy or disorder, there is no sin which is not worthy of eternal death.

Every sin is a viper. There is no viper, if we regard the

nature of the beast, but kills whom she bites : but if one of them shall haply light upon the hand of Paul, she is shaken into the fire without harm done. Let no man fear that harmful creature ever the less, because he sees the Apostle safe from that poison. So is sin to a faithful man.

St. John's word is, *all sin is ἀνομία, transgression of the law*, 1 John iii. 4 ; St. Paul's word is, *the wages of sin is death*, Rom. vi. 23. Put these two together, and this conceit of the natural pardonableness of sin vanishes alone.

Our Rhemists, subtle men, can no more abide this proposition converted than themselves : "All sin indeed," say they, "is ἀνομία, a transgression of the law ; but every transgression of the law is not sin." The Apostle therefore himself turns it for us : *All unrighteousness, saith he, is sin*, 1 John v. 17. "But every ἀνομία is unrighteousness," saith Austin upon the place ; "for the law is the rule of righteousness : therefore the prevarication of the law is unrighteousness." Yea, their very own word shall stop their own mouth ; for how is sin univocally distinguished into venial and mortal if the venial be no sin ? and *the wages of every sin is death*.

That therefore which the papists presume to say, that this kind of sin deserves pardon in itself, unless they will take the word *merit* catachrestically, with Stapleton ; and that which Bellarmine and Navarrus add, that venial sins are not against, but beside the law ; and, lastly, that which Franciscus à Victoria writes, that a bishop's blessing, or a Lord's Prayer, or a knock on the breast, or a little holy-water, or any such like slight receipt, without any other good motion of the heart, is sufficient to remit venial sin ; is so shamefully abhorring from all piety and justice, that these open bawds both of nature and sin must be eternally defied of us. It is an old and as true a rule, "Easiness of pardon gives encouragement to sin."

And beside, what manner of sins do they put in the rank of venials ? Drunkenness, adultery, angry curses or blasphemies, covetousness, yea, stealing, lying, cursing of parents, (horrible offences !) shroud themselves with them under this plausible title of venial. He must needs be shamelessly wicked that abhors not this licentiousness.

Surely Socrates the historian prophesied I think of these men ; "There are some," saith he, "that let go whoredom, as an in-

different matter ; which yet strive for an holy-day as for their life.”

The ordinary and not slight controversy, as Cassander thinketh, of the name, nature, condition, punishment of “the first sin,” as Chrysostom calls it, I willingly omit. Neither do I meddle with their evangelical perfection of vows ; nor the dangerous servitude of their rash and impotent votaries ; nor the inconveniences of their monkery : which yet are so great and many, that the elect cardinals of Paul the Third doubted not with joint consent to affirm, “All the orders of convents we think fit to be abolished.”

But, for the condition of that single and solitary life, let that be done which Cassander and Clingius the Franciscan advise in this case ; that is, let all false conceit and preposterous confidence be removed from it ; that the trust which should only be put in the merit of Christ be not placed upon these courses ; and let no man think that hereby he deserves righteousness, remission, grace : and lastly, which I add, remove but idleness, superstition, necessity, from this kind of life, and we do not, we will not disallow it.

Neither do we take our colleges for any other than certain sacred *ἀσκητήρια*, monastical academies ; wherein, according to the precept of Pelagius the Pope, we may be maturely fitted for these holy services of God and his Church. Such were the monasteries of the ancients : insomuch as Possidonius can witness that St. Austin, out of one little house, sent forth ten labourers into the harvest of the Church.

SECT. XIV.—*Concerning the canon of the Scripture.*

Now, lest I be too tedious, it is time for me, from these points which do directly concern ourselves, to hasten unto those which do more closely touch the majesty of God, and do, as it were, send plain challenges into heaven.

And those do either respect the Scripture, which is his expressed word ; or Christ, which is his natural and consubstantial Word ; or, lastly, the worship due unto his name.

And first, *the Scripture* complains justly of three main wrongs offered to it : the first, of addition to the canon ; the second, of detraction from the sufficiency of it ; the third, of hanging all the authority thereof upon the sleeve of the Church.

For of that corrupt translation of Scripture, which the Trent divines have made only and fully authentical, I forbear purposely to speak: although it were easy to shew (that which Reuchlin, following the steps of Jerome, hath averred), "that the Hebrews drink of the well-head, the Greeks of the stream, and the Latins of the puddle." Neither will I so much as touch the injurious inhibition of those holy books to the laity.

Who can endure a piece of new cloth to be patched unto an old garment? or what can follow hence but that the rent should be worse? Who can abide that, against the faithful information of the Hebrews; against the clear testimonies of ^aMelito, Cyril, Athanasius, Origen, Hilary, Jerome, Ruffinus, Nazianzen; against their own doctors, both of the middle and latest age; six whole books should by their fatherhoods of Trent be under pain of a curse imperiously obtruded upon God and his Church? whereof yet some propose to their readers no better than magical jugglings; others, bloody self-murders; others, lying fables; and others, heathenish rites; not without a public applause in the relation.

These indeed Cajetan ingenuously, as his fashion is, according to that he had learned of Jerome, would persuade us to have been admitted only by the ancients into the canon of manners, not of faith.

And surely there be many precepts in Siracides the counterfeit Solomon, and Esdras, which savour of excellent wisdom: but I wonder what kind of good manners can be learned from suchlike histories, even by those novices to whom Athanasius bequeaths these books! Well may I say of these, as that Chian servant of his master, which sold his wine, and drank his lees, While they have good they seek for naught.

But let these books, how questionable soever to Epiphanius, be all sacred; let them be (according to the meaning of the council of Carthage and of Austin, so oft cited to this purpose) after-Canonical: yet what man or angel dare presume to undertake to make them divine? We know full well how grèat impiety it is to father upon the God of heaven the weak conceptions of an human wit; neither can we be any whit moved with the idle crack of the Tridentine curse, while we hear God thundering in

^a I refer the reader for the citation of these to my "Dissuasive from Popery," [vol. viii.]

our ears, *If any man add unto these words, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book, Apoc. xxii. 18.*

SECT. XV.—*Concerning the insufficiency of Scripture.*

Neither know I whether it be more wickedly audacious to fasten on God those things which he never wrote, or to weaken the authority and deny the sufficiency of what he hath written.

The Papists do both.

“We affirm,” saith Bellarmine, “that there is not expressly contained in scriptures all necessary doctrine either concerning faith or manners.” And the Tridentine fathers give charge, that traditions be received “with no less piety and veneration” than the books of Scripture. “Unwritten truths,” saith our witty chancellor More, “are equivalent to the word of God.”

What place is there for peace?

There are, we confess, certain things of a middle nature, indifferent rites, wherein much must be yielded to the Church, much to traditions: but that those things which are simply necessary to salvation, whether to be known or to be done, should not be found in the holy scriptures, “either in their words or in their sense,” as Aquinas distinguishes, we justly hold absurd; and, with Erasmus, contrary to all true divinity.

Some constitutions for public order are from the Church: but all necessary determinations of faith are to be fetched from the voice of God.

This is, as Nyssen truly commends it, “the right and even rule of life.” *The Law of God is perfect*, saith David, Ps. xix. 7; yea, and *makes perfect*, saith Paul, 2 Tim. iii. 17. And what can be added to that which is already perfect? or what perfection can there be where some necessary points are wanting, yea, if we may believe Hosius, the greatest part?

How much is the Spirit of God mistaken! He wrote these things that we might believe, and in believing, be saved. But now, if Trent may be judge, although we believe what he hath written, yet we cannot be saved unless we do also receive and believe what he hath not written.

How ill was Constantine taught of old! how ill advised in that public speech! for which yet we do not find that any of those worthies of Nice did so much as jog him on the elbow in a mild reproof while he said, “The books of the Evangelists and

Apostles, as also the oracles of the ancient Prophets, do plainly instruct us in the message and meaning of God."

How miserably were every one of the learned Fathers of the Church blinded, that they could never either see or acknowledge any other rule of faith!

And what shall we say? Did God envy unto mankind the full revelation of his will in the perpetual monuments of his written word? or did he not think it expedient to lay up all necessary doctrines in the common storehouse of truths, as Rochester calls it? or is that perhaps more uncertain which is faithfully committed to writing, than that which is carried about by the flying rumours of men, and by this airy conveyance derived unto posterity?

What a thing is it, as Irenæus wisely said, that we should leave the voice of the Lord and his Apostles, and attend to these idle tattlers, that talk never a true word!

Or if this be fitting, how vainly have you spent your labours, O all ye Registers of God, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists! and, as he said of the ointment, *to what purpose was all this waste?* Matt. xxvi. 9.

These paradoxes are pernicious to the Church, and shamefully derogatory from the glory both of the wisdom and goodness of God. Hold these who dare. Surely we can never abide that those two marks of heretics which Irenæus long since set down (namely, not to rest in the bare authority of Scripture and to vaunt of other traditions) should both of them be justly branded on our sides.

SECT. XVI.—*Concerning the authority of Scripture.*

But this is yet most shamefully injurious, to deny unto the word of God credit of itself, and so to hang the Scriptures upon the Church that they must needs beg all their authority from the voices of men.

Honest Eckius, in his revised and corrected Enchiridion, "The Scripture," saith he, "is not authentical without the authority of the Church:" to which, as some golden and oracular sentence, there is added in the margin a glorious and insulting applause, "An Achilles for the Catholics!"

I let pass the blasphemies of Hermannus and Hosius, perhaps, as Junius construes it, in the name of Swinkfeldius. I pass over

the horrible impiety of that shameless gloss which teaches that Solomon's text borrows his credit from the Pope's canonization.

Bellarmino alone shall speak for all, who, going about to support the number of seven Sacraments by the authority of the Tridentine Council, (for this ever is their last hold,) "The strength," saith he, "of all the ancient Councils, and of all opinions, depends upon the authority of the present Church." And a little before, "If we take away the authority of the present Church and of the present Council (of Trent), the decrees of all other Councils and the whole Christian faith may be called into doubt and question."

O miserable and miserably staggering souls of the Papists! How many, not persons only, but whole kingdoms, and those, as the Romanists themselves confess and bewail, mighty and flourishing amongst themselves, do yet still resolutely reject all the authority of that Tridentine Council! What certitude of faith therefore can they have? What hope of salvation? but what? "The whole Christian faith?" "All doctrines and opinions?" What, even those which are written by the finger of God? those that are indited by the Holy Ghost? What is this else but to make God a slave to men, and to arraign the Maker of Heaven and Earth at the bar of human judgment? God will be God, the Scripture of God will be itself in spite of Rome, Trent, hell. And unless we hold this we can have no peace with God; unless we deny it, no peace with the Romanists.

SECT. XVII.—*Concerning Transubstantiation.*

These errors concern the Scriptures. Those which follow concern either Christ's person or his offices

I let pass that idle brabble, as Bellarmine himself judges it, which the Popish censors have unjustly raised about the Son's Godhead of himself, and insist upon weightier quarrels.

I would that exploded opinion of transubstantiation, and, which is the root of it, the multipresence of Christ's body, did not utterly overthrow the truth of his humanity.

Good God! Is it possible, as Averroes jested of old, that Christians should make themselves a god of bread? that any reasonable man can believe that Christ carried his own body in one of his hands? that he raught it forth to be eaten by those holy guests of his which saw him present with them, and heard him speaking to them; both while they were eating him, and when

they had eaten the sacred morsel? that the self-same Son of man should at once both devour his whole self, and yet should sit whole and entire at the table with them? that the glorious body of Christ should be carried through the unclean passages of our maws; and either be there turned into the substance of our body, or, contrary to that the Spirit said of old, *Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption*, Ps. xvi 10, should be subject to putrefaction, or vanish to nothing, or return into that heaven wherein it was, ere it returned, while it returned; or, lastly, should be eaten with mice, (devout and holy vermin!) or perhaps mixed with poison to the receiver?

What monsters of follies are these! How mad, yea, how impious is this obstinacy of foolish men, that they will overturn the very principles of nature, the order of things, the humanity of their Saviour, the truth of the Sacrament, the constant judgment of Scripture, and, lastly, the very foundations of all divinity; and confusedly jumble heaven and earth together, rather than they will, where necessity requires it, admit but of a tropical kind of speech in our Saviour's consecration; while in the mean time, the whole reverend senate of the fathers cries out and redoubles the names of symbols, types, signs, representation, similitude, figures, and whatever word may import a borrowed sense; notwithstanding all the indignation of Heaven, all the scorn of pagans, all the reluctance of the Church!

This letter killeth, as Origen truly speaks. Now what likelihood is there here of agreement?

That the true body of Christ is truly offered and truly received in the Sacrament, which of us hath not ever constantly taught and defended? But how is this? not by any bodily touch, as Cyril and Ambrose say well, but by our faith. That it should be corporally, carnally, orally present, and torn in pieces with our teeth, as good pope Nicholas caused Herengarius to say, and our Allen hath followed him unbidden, hath ever seemed impious to us, and, as Austin judges it, no less than flagitious.

We like well yet the ingenuity of Arias Montanus in this point, who, upon Luke xxii. 19, *This is my body*, saith he, "That is, my body is sacramentally contained in this sacrament of bread:" and straight he adds, like another Nicodemus, Christ's nightly disciple, "The secret and most mystical manner whereof God will once vouchsafe more clearly to unfold to his Christian Church."

Thus he. In the meantime, for us, this prodigious conceit of

transubstantiation, which alone contains in it as many absurd errors, as there have been minutes of time from the first forming of it, that is, from the Council of Lateran until this hour, can look to be entertained no otherwise at our hands than as such a devilish fancy deserveth—with hatred and execration.

SECT. XVIII.—*Concerning the multipresence of Christ's body.*

But this sleeveless tale of transubstantiation was surely brought both into the world and upon the stage by that other fable of the multipresence of Christ's body. Neither know I whether I should prefer for madness and sophistical cozenage.

That the same body of Christ should be in a thousand places at once of this sublunary world, while yet it is in the mean time entire in heaven; that the whole body of Christ should lie hid in a little thin wafer, yet so that the parts and members thereof should not one run into another, but continue distinct and severally disposed among themselves, and have a shape and order agreeable to a man's body, which are Bellarmine's own words; it doth not only exceed reason, but faith.

Neither do they say now, as of old, *Behold, here is Christ, or there*, Matt. xxiv. 23, but, which is much worse, "Behold, Christ is both here and there."

That received axiom of the schools is of an eternal truth: "The numerical unity of a finite thing cannot stand without continuity."

Who can choose but be ashamed of the Jesuits here? The very places in which Christ's body is, saith Bellarmine, are discontinued; yea, and the body of Christ itself is divided from itself in respect of place, but not in respect of his proper substance or quantity. As if there could be any division of a material substance but by bounds of place; as if quantity were not both bounded and measured by place alone; as if there were not an undoubted relation of the place to the thing placed.

But now this doth not belong to Christ only. St. Xavier in our age, one of Loyola's brood, was seen at once both in the ship and in the boat: Turselline reports it. Unto this fabulous saint, and his fellow-fabuler the reporter, I cannot devise to set a better match than that Plautine Amphitrio: "Darest thou say, thou fond slave, that which never man yet saw, nor indeed can be done, that one man should at the same time be in two places at once?"

How far wide is Aquinas, the honour of the schools, which saith, "By the same ground or reason that an angel might be in two places, he might be in as many as you will!" See now, either Xavier is everywhere, or else the carcass of a friar is more subtle than the nature of an angel. To conclude, either Aquinas is false or the papists ubiquitaries.

How overbold are the Jesuits, the patrons of this multipresence! Bellarmine, scorning the modesty of Thomas, Egidius, Carthusian, Capreolus; "Because," saith he, "we think that the body of Christ may be in many places at once, locally and visibly, therefore we say and hold, that the same body may be circumscriptively and definitively in more places at once. For that a body may be circumscriptively in any place, nothing is required, but that it be fitly measured unto that place; so as the bounds of the place and the thing placed be both together: but it is not required that it should not be elsewhere, as in another place." Thus he. What an absurd opposition is this! To be circumscribed in one place, and yet to be elsewhere! that the bounds of the place and the thing placed should be equal to each other! and yet that the thing placed should be but one and the places a thousand, that a thing should be fitly commensured by one place, and yet be in almost infinite! that another remote place should less hinder circumscription than a part of the next place! What is to be mad, if this be to be wise? Who cannot but laugh at "the wise folly" of these men? as Irenæus said of the Valentinians.

But I willingly hear that of Chrysostom: "To conceive of divine things by philosophy is no other than to take out a red hot iron with our fingers, and not with tongs:" and that of Augustin; "Yield God able to do something which thou art not able to understand." It is reported, that Aristotle misled Aëtius the heretic into that filthy error of Arius; and Tertullian hath taught us that all heresies are suborned by philosophy. What hath Athens to do with Jerusalem, the Academy with the Church? Away with arguments where faith is in question, as Thomas ingenuously says out of Ambrose.

But what is all this to us? It is well yet, and I do heartily congratulate it to our men, that the idle tale of Surius, concerning Melancthon and Carolostadius, and other protestants, abandoning of all philosophy, wherewith yet Binius pleased himself of late, is thus hissed out of countenance, and vanished. Belike now the reformed doctors are philosophers, but too much.

For us, we do easily grant, that many things are done which we cannot understand ; but these things we grant not, because we understand they cannot be done.

God hath absolute power, as Thomas speaks truly, over the whole nature of the creature ; but not so as that he should cause it to be and not to be at once. This, as Sadeel says wittily, *Deus potenter non potest*. The object of God's power, as the Jesuits' School willingly confesses, is, whatsoever implies not a contradiction in itself. Now, that the selfsame body should sit down and yet not sit down ; should be visible, and invisible ; divisible and continued, and yet discontinued and indivisible ; to be all here, to be all elsewhere ; to be here greater, there less ; to be one, and many ; the same, and divers ; to depart, and not to depart ; to be contained in heaven, and not to be contained ; to be a quantity, without space ; to be measured by and fitted to a place, and not to take up any place ; to be accidents, and yet not to be inherent ; to be formerly, yet to be made ; to be made, and not to be made ; to be otherwise in places than in a place ; to be a true body, and yet to be spiritually : that boy were well worthy of whipping that cannot discern and confess manifest contradictions.

But what do I spend time in this thorny discourse ? This one word shall shut and sum up all—that this wicked pair of opinions offers plain violence to the true humanity of Christ ; neither can ever, *salva fide*, be reconciled with the evangelical truth.

SECT. XIX.—*Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

The priestly office of Christ is not a little impeached by the daily oblation of the missal sacrifice and number of mediators.

For the first ; That in this sacred supper there is a sacrifice in that sense wherein the Fathers spake none of us ever doubted : but that is then either latreutical, as Bellarmine distinguishes it not ill, or eucharistical : there is here, as Chrysostom speaks, “ a remembrance of a sacrifice ; ” that is, as Augustin interprets it, a memorial of Christ's passion celebrated in the Church. And from this sweet commemoration of our redemption there arises another sacrifice, the sacrifice of praise ; and from thence a true peace-offering of the Christian soul.

These three sacrifices offer themselves to us here ; but for any propitiatory sacrifice, unless it be, as the Gloss interprets it, re-

presentatively, I find none; none essential; none, as the Tridentines labour to persuadè, true and proper.

Neither indeed can there be. For, what? Doth the priest offer the same that Christ hath offered? or another?

If another, then not propitiatory; for only Christ is our propitiation.

If the same, then not an unbloody sacrifice; for Christ's sacrifice was a bloody one; then, the natural being of Christ should again be destroyed; then, the blood of the Mediator, which I abhor to imagine, must be of a finite value and power. Yea, Christ himself did not sacrifice on the table, but on the cross; for if the sacrifice which he offered in his supper were perfect and fully propitiatory, what needed he to die afterward? wherefore was his blood shed upon the cross, which, by his transubstantiated blood, not yet shed, had formerly redeemed the world?

But if it be unbloody, then it is not propitiatory; for *without shedding of blood*, saith the apostle, *is no remission*, Heb. ix. 22.

Or what opposition is there betwixt the order of Melchisedec and Aaron, betwixt Christ and the priests of the old Law, if this office do equally pass and descend in a long pedigree of mortal successors? or why were the legal sacrifices of the Jewish synagogue so oft repeated, but because they were not perfect? and how can, or why should, that which is most absolutely perfect be reiterated?

To conclude; what can either be spoken or conceived more plain than those words of God, *once offered, one sacrifice, one oblation*, Heb. ix. 28 and x. 12, 14. And yet these popish shavelings, devout men! take upon them to crucify and sacrifice Christ again; and while they solemnly offer the Son of God up unto his Father, they humbly beseech him, in a religious blasphemy, that he would be pleased to bless and accept that oblation. It is not for us, I confess, to be so devout. We will remember this holy sacrifice of Christ, as Cassander well advises, and celebrate it with a thankful heart; we will not repeat it. We will gladly receive our Saviour, offered by himself to his Father, and offered to us by his Father: we will not offer him to his Father. Which one point while we stick at, as we needs must, we are strait stricken with the thunderbolt of the anathema of Trent. Here can be therefore no possibility of peace.

SECT. XX.—*Concerning the number of Mediators and the Invocation of Saints.*

It doth not more belong to the priesthood of Christ that he offered himself once for us a spotless sacrifice upon the altar of his cross, than that he daily offers to his Father the incense of our prayers on the altar of heaven. As therefore many sacrifices, so, many mediators, plainly seem to put Christ out of office.

Neither indeed hath the number of intercessors more increased in this old age of the world than the impiety of imploring them. For the modester judgment of the former schools so framed to itself a distinction of mediation, that it challenged one kind thereof as proper only to Christ, thinking the other might be imparted unto saints; but our late doctors, wilfully breaking the bars both of logic and divinity, have rashly encroached upon all the offices of a Mediator; and whatsoever might by any right belong to an agent for peace, all that, if not more, have they attributed to the saints.

Hereupon, one says to the blessed Virgin, "O Saviouress, save me:" another, "Obtain thou pardon, apply grace, prepare glory for me:" others, if we may believe Cassander, famous divines, have said, that "God hath translated one half of his kingdom, which consists of mercy, to the blessed Virgin Mary; reserving the other half, of justice, to himself:" others, that "we may appeal from the bar of God's justice to Mary's court of mercy." Others have so compared their Francis with Christ, that, I tremble to speak it, whether of these was the typical Jesus might seem questionable to the reader. Hear the holy muse of Turselline:

Francis that was shall now be Christ to thee:

And soon after,

And Christ that was saint Francis now shall be.

O tongue, worthy to be cut out of that blasphemous mouth, as Jerome said of his *Vigilantius*, and be made into gobbets!

Neither hath this impious parasite or his *Sedulius* done more for their stigmatical Francis than the holy archbishop Antonius hath done for his Dominick in an emulation of blasphemy. There wants nothing, that I can see, but "that everlasting gospel of the friars:" and it wanted not much, if histories say true, of prevailing:

Oh, what mad gowns have swayed the Roman state!
as their poet said of old.

Others have sacrilegiously turned Litanies, Creeds, Psalters, and whatever God meant to honour himself by, unto the name of the holy Virgin. And I would to God this were only the private misdevotion of some superstitious old wife, or some idle and silly cloisterer. Fain would our charity conceive so, which is still credulous, and, as the apostle commands, *thinks not evil*, 1 Cor. xiii. 5, if Cassander did not directly tell us, that they publicly sing in their very churches this devout anthem:

O happy Mother of that Son
Which hast all our sins foredone :
Out of a Mother's right, we pray thee,
Bid our Redeemer to obey thee :

if all these were not openly approved by the holy censors of the Roman Church, severe controllers of manners! yea, by the voices of their own popes: if at this day (witness the muses of Bencius and Bonarscius) the Jesuits did not both speak and write thus.

But let us leave these bold impieties, if you will, to their Bernardines, Antonines, Bartholemews of Pisa, Tursellines. Bring us forth their more sober divines, Polydores, Cassanders, Vives: even their opinions will not down with us, which teach that the saints are in any wise to be prayed unto.

Indeed the protestants say, as Bellarmine grants, that the saints pray for us, but only in a generality. Bucer said truly, that the saints have great love to their militant brethren, great desire of their salvation; and so doubtless have the angels. But must we therefore single out any one of those blessed spirits to aid us, to sue for us in the court of heaven? God forbid! for upon what faith must these prayers of ours be grounded? unless perhaps, as Hosius saith, we must believe in the saints also.

Yea, how sure are we that none of the saints can either search the heart, the fountain of our prayers; or at once hear ten thousand of their suppliants, distant in place from each other! Yea, further, if, as there should be no limits set to religion all the world over, devout clients should at once jointly commend and prostrate themselves humbly to some one saint; it is not a swiftness of nature, as Jerome contends, that would serve the turn: a true ubiquity, as Bellarmine confesses, must be required to the hearing of all those prayers.

What hinders now, but that they which of sinful men have made saints should of their saints make gods also?

Besides, which of the prophets, which of the apostles ever commanded this? which of the saints of the former world hath ever done it? or what other, if credit may be given to Theodoret, did St. Paul forbid, under the worship of angels, to his Colossians? or what was the heresy of the Collyridians, if this must go for piety?

That rule of Epiphanius shall be ever a safe course for us: "Let Mary be honoured; but the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost "worshipped." Here is no fear of danger, but that we may go safely to that God which calls us to him; and prostrate ourselves to his Christ, our gracious Saviour. None of the saints can envy God this honour; none of them ever did either arrogate it to himself or suffer it to be given him. Neither is there any of them whom God ever allowed either to take it to himself or to impart it to others, or to accept it quietly being imparted to him by others.

The papists, therefore, may come to us when they will with safety and advantage: we may not yield to them without manifest danger of idolatrous dotage.

SECT. XXI.—*Concerning the superstitious, heathenish, and ridiculous Worship of the Papists.*

But if any good-natured reconciler shall be so indifferent as to think these weighty points of difference not to be so heinous, but that every one might secretly maintain what opinion he list; yet so that, as Constantine said to Alexander and Arius, while the minds differ the outward peace may be preserved; let him further understand, that the continual practice of the religious worship and service of God will ever both raise and proclaim no less hostility than matter of judgment.

In our devotions, and public exercises of piety, and places consecrated to this use, there is nothing that can offend either the eye or the mind of a papist, except the bareness of our walls, and the apostolical simplicity of ceremonies; an easy fault, and such as it is no praise of their ingenuity to wink at; for long since have those clauses of our public Liturgy been purposely blotted out which in our grandfathers' days did but lightly touch this galled sore of popery.

But contrariwise in the popish churches there is scarce any thing either said or done whereof we can with a clear and unwounded conscience be either partakers or witnesses. Their very

walls kill us dead ; but their ridiculous or demoniacal service who can endure ?

We honour, as we ought, the dear and happy memory of the saints ; and chiefly the leader of that heavenly choir, the blessed Virgin, “ the Mother of God :” and whatsoever she can think not to be dishonourable to herself and her Lord and Saviour, we will most gladly give it her to the full.

Neither will we only glorify God in his saints, as Augustin hath taught Durand to speak ; but we will magnify the saints, as opportunity serves, for their excellent graces and worthy acts, both in God and in themselves : we will admire, extol, and, what we may, imitate their singular constancy, faith, sanctity, as Sidonius said of his Claudian,

No tomb can either soul or glory shroud.

But to dig up their holy bones, that I may borrow Luther’s word, out of their quiet graves ; and to fall down before these wormeaten monuments of the saints ; to expect from them a divine power whether of cure or of sanctification ; equally to respect Francis’s cowl, Anna’s comb, Joseph’s breeches, Thomas’s shoe, as Erasmus complains, with the Son of God himself ; can seem no better to us than an horrible impiety.

Neither can we abide either to deify men or to canonize beasts. It seems that cardinal could abide it well in whose garden is yet to be seen this epitaph, which he wrote upon his too-dearly-beloved bitch :

This tomb for thee, dear bitch, I builded have,
That worthier wert of heaven than a grave.

We, profane Huguenots, cannot skill of worshipping Martin’s boots, or George’s scabbard, or Crispin’s paring-knife, or (which they say is kept in a certain town of Liguria), the tail of that ass which Christ rode upon ; or Roche’s dog, or Antony’s swine : and surely he had need of a very thick hide that can do this.

But in earnest, say we should yield these adorations to be lawful and godly ; what Macarius, amongst so many woods of counterfeit trees, can show us the true cross ? or what Helena, amongst such heaps, yea hills of iron, can shew us the true nails ? Assuredly both these jugglers smile one upon another, while they show these relics to their people : and now, even the silly vulgar begins, not without indignation, to descry this cozenage.

To omit therefore these ridiculous tricks and knavish convey-

ances of their shavelings, let us in this case appeal even to Cassander's own moderation, who, having first honestly acknowledged the ancient complaints of Basil, Ambrose, Augustin, about the business of these abuses, goes on thus: "It appears," saith he, "that in the latter times there hath been too much given to the relics and monuments of the saints: so as even good men, and those which were zealously devout, were grown to that pass, that they placed the sum of all religion in gathering together the relics of the saints, and in garnishing them richly with gold and pearls, and building sumptuous chapels and temples to them: and again, those that were lewd and godless, put all their confidence, though vain and false, in the foolish and superstitious worship of relics. Wherefore in the council of Cabillon those are reproved, who, in a pretence of devotion, go on pilgrimage to Rome, or Turon, or any other like places; as if they thought that the frequenting of these holy shrines could both purge them from sin and license them to sin with impunity. And unto this yet another mischief hath been added; that, for covetousness' sake, to entice the simple people, false relics have been devised, and feigned miracles reported; and by those miracles the superstition of the multitude was so fed, that they were rather taken up with an admiration of the wonders, than drawn to a holy imitation of the saints. And many times, by the subtlety and illusion of the devil, abusing the superstition of men, new relics were by dreams and visions revealed to the world, and by the operation of the same devil miracles seemed to be wrought for the confirmation thereof." Thus saith Cassander; like a true German, shall I say, or like a true Israelite?

But we, that have been better taught, dare freely and confidently say of ourselves, as Jerome professed of old, in the name of all Christians, "So far are we from adoring the relics of martyrs, that we worship neither sun, nor moon, nor angels, nor archangels, nor cherubin, nor seraphin, nor any name that is named either in the present world or in the future, lest we should serve the creature rather than the Creator which is blessed for ever."

Then—that from relics we may descend to images—is it possible that we should not be ever displeased with that frantic superstition of the Romish church? that, against the tables of God's Law, against the institutions of the apostles, against the practice of the ancient church, against the manifest decrees of

councils, against the clear testimonies of Fathers, in defiance of God and men, the churches of Christians should be no less pestered with idols than the temples of the heathen? that, as Jerome complained of old, the native beauty of the Church should be polluted with the filth of paganism? that, which Eusebius justly taxeth of madness, there should be a visible and bodily image or representation made of the invisible and spiritual God? that we should put our confidence in *Agnis Dei*, grains, tapers, roses, swords, ensigns, bells, ridiculously after their manner enchanted? that, by certain magical exorcisms, the devil should be driven out of those creatures wherein he never was? Nay, let us even enter into league with Satan himself, if we shall give either allowance or connivance to such diabolical practices of will-worship.

I do purposely forbear to speak of that profane paradox of the sufficiency of the outward work done, without good inward dispositions; the idle mumbling up of prayers in a foreign tongue; the number and virtue of sacraments; the sacrilegious mutilation of the eucharist; and a thousand other monsters both opinions and ceremonies.

These that I have reckoned are errors more than enow. And I would to God those which we have here particularised were not such that there is no remedy but that we must needs eternally fall out either with God or with Rome.

Since therefore neither truth can ever yield nor obstinacy will yield, let us serve cheerfully under the colours of our heavenly Leader, and both proclaim and maintain an unreconcilable war with these Romish heresies.

SECT. XXII.—*Concerning the impossibility of the means of reconciliation.*

And now, since no wise man can suspect of us that we will ever grow to that height of madness as to run perfidiously from the standard of God to the tents of that Roman antichrist, is there any hope that the papists will ever be drawn back to the sound and pure judgment of the primitive antiquity? O that God would vouchsafe this grace to the Christian world! that we could but comfort ourselves with the hope of so great happiness!

What a sight were this, how pleasant, how worthy of God and his angels, that, as it is said of the Novatian faction and the orthodox of old, men, women, children of both parts, without all

guile and close harbours of discontentment, should mutually bring stones and mortar to the building up of this temple of another, yet true, resurrection!

We will gladly speak unto them (and if need be, upon our knees) in Cyprian's words: "Sithence we may not come forth of the sound and true Church of God, and come unto you; let us beseech and entreat you, by whatsoever should be most dear unto you, that you would return to our fraternity, and into the bosom of that mother Church whence ye are revolted:" and as he said in Theocritus, "yet, at last, be persuaded. We are both brothers of one blood. Why will ye needs fight more against yourselves than your brethren?"

But, alas! sooner may God create a new Rome than reform the old. Yea, needs must that the Church put off itself, and cease to be what it is, ere it can begin to be once again what it was: for, as the comic poet said in the like; "Both substance, credit, fame, virtue, honour, have at once forsaken her, and by long disuse have left her worse than naught: neither do I see how these houses can be repaired, but they must be pulled down to the very foundations, and then built from the ground."

But if there be any likelihood of remedy yet to be hoped for, surely it must needs come either from herself or from others.

Can it be first from herself which obstinately defends her errors, not only with tongue and pen, but with fire and sword too? which will not yield so much as that she can err? which refused to amend those notorious abuses which by the moderate verdict of her elect cardinals were condemned? and lastly, which by the palpable flatteries of her last and worst parasites, the Jesuits, is grown, not secure only, but prouder than ever she was?

Can it be then from others? How oft hath this been endeavoured in vain! Rome may be sacked and battered, as it hath often been by military forces; but purged by admonitions, convictions, censures, it will never be. I remember, on this occasion, what Sisinnius the lector advised bishop Nectarius in the like case: that he had ever found disputations so far from reconciling of schisms, that they are still wont to inflame the minds of heretics to suffer contention.

What then? can it be from herself and others? Alas! how should it, unless either others had power or herself had will to be redressed? For certainly, if there be any one spark of good hope yet alive, it must be in the aid and determination of a gene-

ral council : and such a synod is no less impossible than reconciliation itself. For who shall call it? who shall sit president in it? who shall be present and give their voices? what shall be the rule of the decisions? what the order of execution?

Let them bring forth, if they will, the sister or the daughter of that their Tridentine assembly : who can hold from smiles and scorn? Forsooth, they would deal with us (as Luther wittily jested of the summoning of this council by Paul the Third) much like unto them that mock a hungry dog with a crust and a knife; who, instead of giving him the bread, let him feel the haft. Well may we resolve, with Nazianzen, to avoid all such meetings of bishops; for that no such synod ever did good, but tended rather to the decay than advantage of the Church.

I remember Isidore derives the Latin word *Concilium*, *a ciliis oculorum*; for that all direct the sight of their minds into one centre. There can therefore be no council held by those which profess a general and public disagreement of judgment. In vain should we endeavour any such course, unless every one of them would resolve to think of peace at home; and would persuade his heart, laying aside all prejudice and wilful respects of faction, ingenuously to submit himself to the truth, when it once appears, and more to regard their souls than their estates.

For can we think it equal, as things now stand, that the same parties should be allowed witnesses, plaintiffs, defendants, judges in their own cause? or shall we perhaps hope, that those privileges which have hitherto been treacherously and tyrannically usurped by papists will now, upon better advisement, be ingenuously given up by them and renounced? or that they will now, at last, thunder and lighten anathemas against their own heads? Some fools may hope for this which are unacquainted with that old verse so common in the mouth and pen of Lipsius,

Moribus antiquis Res stat Romana, virisque.

But for us, unless He that doth wonders alone, by his stretched-out arm from heaven, should mightily, beyond all hope, effect this, we know too well that it cannot be done.

Only this one thing, which God hath promised, we do verily expect; to see the day when the Lord Jesus shall with the breath of his mouth, destroy this *lawless man*, 2 Thess. ii. 8, long since revealed to his Church; and, by the brightness of his glorious coming, fully discover and despatch him. Not only in

the means and way, but in the end also, is Rome opposite to heaven. The heaven shall pass away by a change of quality, not an utter destruction of substance; Rome, by destruction, not by change. Of us therefore and them shall that old bucolic verse be verified :

Out of each other's breast their swords they drew,
Nor would they rest till one the other slew.

GLORY TO GOD !
VICTORY TO THE TRUTH !
WAR WITH HERESY !
PEACE TO THE CHURCH !
AMEN.